THEOLOGY

Digest

ECCLESIASTICAL FAITH
Bishop Fidel G. Martinez

DEVELOPMENT OF PROTESTANTISM
E. W. Zeeden

CHRIST IN THE PSALMS
Balthasar Fischer

ENDS OF MARRIAGE
Louis Lochet

WHAT IS A LAYMAN?
Yves Congar, O.P.

SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER
J. Van Camp

NAME OF JESUS
C. Spicq, O.P.

PARTICIPATION IN MASS
Clifford Howell, S.J.

SENSES OF SCRIPTURE
J. Coppens

PRIESTHOOD OF THE FAITHFUL
H. Francis Davis

Brief and ACCURATE

CONDENSATIONS OF CAREFULLY SELECTED ARTICLES

Vol. I, No. 1, Winter 1953

THEOLOGY DIGEST

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published for the large number of priests, religious, seminarians, and laity who are interested in present-day theological thought, but who perhaps find it hard to maintain and cultivate this interest. Besides the obvious difficulty that the literature appearing in many different languages is so extensive, there is the further difficulty that many important periodicals are not generally available.

THEOLOGY DIGEST aims to help such readers to keep informed of current problems and developments in theology by presenting a concise sampling of current periodical writings in theology. Articles are selected for their significance, interest, and digestibility, after a thorough examination of most of the theological journals in Europe and America. These articles are carefully translated and condensed so as to represent, accurately and succinctly, the thought and spirit of the original. For readers who wish to consult the originals for the documentation and detailed development necessarily omitted from digests and abstracts, THEOLOGY DIGEST can also serve as a guide to further reading and study.

The digests deal with the various branches of theological learning—Apologetics, Dogmatic Theology, Scripture, Moral Theology and Canon Law, Ascetics, Liturgy, and Church History—with emphasis on the speculative rather than the pastoral aspects of theology.

The opinions expressed in these digests are not necessarily those of the editors.

THEOLOGY DIGEST Staff: Editor: Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J.; Managing Editor: Wendell E. Langley, S.J.; Copy Editor: William H. Walsh, S.J.; Business Manager: Jerome E. Rohrer, S.J.; Associate Editors: Robert V. Callen, S.J.; Daniel T. Costello, S.J.; John H. Edwards, S.J.; Robert J. Kelly, S.J.; Edward L. Maginnis, S.J.; Joseph A. Ross, S.J.; John R. Sheets, S.J.; Clarence M. Wagener, S.J.

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published in the Winter, Spring, and Autumn of each year by St. Mary's College, the School of Divinity of St. Louis University. Subscription price in U. S., Canada, and countries of the Pan-American Union, $2.00. Foreign, $2.25. Single copies, 75 cents.

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published with permission of ecclesiastical superiors, and all its contents are copyright by St. Mary's College, 1952.

Editorial address:

THEOLOGY DIGEST
St. Mary's College
St. Marys, Kansas

Business address (subscriptions and change of address):

THEOLOGY DIGEST
1015 Central
Kansas City 5, Missouri

Comments on Previous Experimental Issues

His Eminence
Samuel Cardinal Stritch

"I think it is very worthwhile to publish this Digest and to give our priests particularly the more important writings in the theological journals which appear in various parts of the world. It is practically impossible for the average priest to read all these journals, and this Digest keeps him informed on the more important articles which appear."

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen

"I find it (the Digest) very interesting, and I searched about for a subscription blank in order that I might have some share in the continuation of this worthy Digest. I will be grateful for any further information concerning it."

Bishop John B. Franz

"I started to read 'Theology Digest' last night and found it so satisfying that I did not lay it down until I had read forty pages . . ."

Rev. Robert G. Boucher, C.S.S.R.,
Professor of Sacred Scripture,
Oconomowoc, Wisconsin.

"An excellent lure to seminarians into the storehouse of theological treasure in foreign languages."

Rev. Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B.,
Editor, *Worship,* and Theology Professor, St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota.

"The 'digest' . . . a real 'shot in the arm', boosting theological interest among the clergy. And Lord knows how greatly that's needed. I . . . told (the) seminarians in class about it, and they were enthusiastic."

Rev. Charles E. Sheedy, C.S.C.,
Head of the Department of Religion, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Indiana

"I think that it is a wonderful idea and I wish you a great deal of success. This type of publication is, in my opinion, keying in very neatly with the type of reading that should be done in seminaries . . ."

ORDER FORM

THEOLOGY DIGEST
1015 Central St.
Kansas City 5, Missouri

This is my subscription to THEOLOGY DIGEST for one year at $2.00 ($2.25 Foreign).

Name

Street

City, Zone and State

(Payment is enclosed)

A Partial List of Journals Consulted in Selecting Articles for Theology Digest

l'Action Populaire
Vanves, FRANCE

l'Ami du Clergé
Langres, FRANCE

Angelicum
Rome, ITALY

Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Washington, D. C.

Ciencia Tomista
Salamanca, SPAIN

Clergy Review
London, ENGLAND

Collectanea Mechliniensis
Mechlin, BELGIUM

Dieu Vivant
Paris, FRANCE

Divus Thomas
Freiburg, SWITZERLAND

Doctor Communis
Rome, ITALY

Downside Review
Stratton-on-the-Fosse, ENGLAND

Eglise Vivante
Louvain, BELGIUM

Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
Louvain, BELGIUM

Estudios Eclesiásticos
Madrid, SPAIN

Geist und Leben
Munich, GERMANY

Irish Ecclesiastical Record
Maynooth, IRELAND

Irish Theological Quarterly
Maynooth, IRELAND

Liturgia
Burgos, SPAIN

Maison-Dieu
Paris, FRANCE

Manresa
Madrid, SPAIN

The Month
London, ENGLAND

Nouvelle Revue Théologique
Louvain, BELGIUM

Questions Liturgiques
Louvain, BELGIUM

Razón y Fe
Madrid, SPAIN

Recherches des Science Religieuse
Paris, FRANCE

Revue Biblique
Jerusalem, JORDAN

Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques
Soisy-sur-Seine, FRANCE

Revue d'Univ. d'Ottawa
Ottawa, CANADA

Scholastik
Frankfort, GERMANY

Theological Studies
Woodstock, MARYLAND

Theologie und Glaube
Paderborn, GERMANY

Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift
Linz, AUSTRIA

Verbum Domini
Rome, ITALY

Vie Spirituelle
Paris, FRANCE

Worship
Collegeville, MINNESOTA

Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie
Innsbruck, AUSTRIA

THEOLOGY Digest

Liturgy and the Teaching Church 3
Roger Aubert

What Is a Layman? 8
Yves Congar, O.P.

The Different Senses of Sacred Scripture 15
Joseph Coppens

The Ends of Marriage 21
Louis Lochet

The Sacramental Character 28
J. Van Camp

The Name of Jesus in the New Testament 33
Ceslaus Spicq, O.P.

Problems of Participation in the Mass 39
Clifford Howell, S.J.

The Internal Development of Protestantism 43
E. W. Zeeden

The Priesthood of the Faithful 49
Msgr. H. Francis Davis

Christ in the Psalms 53
Balthasar Fischer

Ecclesiastical Faith 59
Fidel G. Martinez, D.D.

ALMA COLLEGE LIBRARY Alma California

Brief and ACCURATE

CONDENSATIONS OF CAREFULLY SELECTED ARTICLES

Vol. I, No. 1, Winter 1953

THEOLOGY DIGEST

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published for the large number of priests, religious, seminarians, and laity who are interested in present-day theological thought, but who perhaps find it hard to maintain and cultivate this interest. Besides the obvious difficulty that the literature appearing in many different languages is so extensive, there is the further difficulty that many important periodicals are not generally available.

THEOLOGY DIGEST aims to help such readers to keep informed of current problems and developments in theology by presenting a concise sampling of current periodical writings in theology. Articles are selected for their significance, interest, and digestibility, after a thorough examination of most of the theological journals in Europe and America. These articles are carefully translated and condensed so as to represent, accurately and succinctly, the thought and spirit of the original. For readers who wish to consult the originals for the documentation and detailed development necessarily omitted from digests and abstracts, THEOLOGY DIGEST can also serve as a guide to further reading and study.

The digests deal with the various branches of theological learning—Apologetics, Dogmatic Theology, Scripture, Moral Theology and Canon Law, Ascetics, Liturgy, and Church History—with emphasis on the speculative rather than the pastoral aspects of theology.

The opinions expressed in these digests are not necessarily those of the editors.

THEOLOGY DIGEST Staff: Editor: Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J.; Managing Editor: Wendell E. Langley, S.J.; Copy Editor: William H. Walsh, S.J.; Business Manager: Jerome E. Rohrer, S.J.; Associate Editors: Robert V. Callen, S.J.; Daniel T. Costello, S.J.; John H. Edwards, S.J.; Robert J. Kelly, S.J.; Edward L. Maginnis, S.J.; Joseph A. Ross, S.J.; John R. Sheets, S.J.; Clarence M. Wagener, S.J.

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published in the Winter, Spring, and Autumn of each year by St. Mary's College, the School of Divinity of St. Louis University. Subscription price in U. S., Canada, and countries of the Pan-American Union, $2.00. Foreign, $2.25. Single copies, 75 cents.

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published with permission of ecclesiastical superiors, and all its contents are copyright by St. Mary's College, 1952.

Editorial address: THEOLOGY DIGEST
St. Mary's College
St. Marys, Kansas

Business address (subscriptions and change of address):
THEOLOGY DIGEST
1015 Central
Kansas City 5, Missouri

LIBRARY

Introduction--

OUR AIM

Deep spiritual unrest has plagued millions of men during the past half century. Two World Wars with their attendant misery and inhumanity, a worldwide economic depression, and the rise of totalitarian dictatorships have shattered the illusory dreams of unlimited human progress. The great issues of life are drawn with appalling clarity for the modern man, and men are groping for something beyond man that can provide an ultimate answer.

The acuteness of humanity's problems, the critical need of a definite religious solution to the enigmas of human history, have shaken many religious thinkers from their complacency and made them realize that religion is not a matter for detached abstract theorizing, but a force that must infuse and vitalize human life. Blatant paganism and Christianity are locked in a death struggle for the souls of men, and men need the guidance of God's revelation and the strength of God's grace so that they can choose sanctity rather than sin.

This crisis has had a most profound impact on Protestant religious thought, but it has also had a deep influence on Catholic theologians. In our era which is marked by the rise of the proletariat, the great focal truth of the supernatural social unity of the Church, Christ's Mystical Body, has come to the foreground in Catholic thinking. Guided by the clear dogmatic documents of the Councils of Trent and Vatican—so providentially given in God's foreseeing wisdom—Catholic theologians have been exploring the riches of the Church's teaching about herself and her unity with her divine Head.

The nature and structure of the Church, her office of preserving, developing, and teaching the truth of revelation, her sacramental life with its ample provision for the sanctification of all Christ's members, the sacramental character which at once differentiates priests from people and provides the doctrinal basis for the modern emphasis on the role of the layman—all of these are now the object of careful study and thought.

From this theological resurgence there is emerging a deeper consciousness of the riches of Catholic teaching and Catholic life. Catholic thought, very much alive today, is becoming increasingly aware of its vocation in today's world: it must give men in concrete, vital, and clear form the only answer to today's dilemma. That answer is Christ, Christ as He still lives on in the Church.

This issue of THEOLOGY DIGEST, which begins the magazine's regular publication, points to a few main currents of present-day theological thought. Obviously, these few digests do little more than scratch the surface. There is a great wealth of contemporary theological writing with which an interested Catholic should be acquainted. It is our hope that future issues of THEOLOGY DIGEST will gradually introduce its readers to this treasure.

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES IN THIS ISSUE

Canon Roger Aubert is a professor at the University of Louvain in Belgium. A specialist in fundamental theology, his book on the act of faith (*L'Acte de Foi,* Louvain, 1950) is probably the most complete treatment of that subject yet writen.

Fr. Yves M.-J. Congar, O.P., professor at Le Saulchoir, France, is an acknowledged leader in the theological world today. During the past few years his attention and writings have centered on ecclesiology, particularly on the role of the laity in the Church.

Professor Joseph Coppens of the University of Louvain, commonly recognized as one of Europe's finest Scripture scholars, has drawn wide attention in recent years by his studies on the meaning of Scripture.

Monsignor H. Francis Davis is professor and Vice-Rector at St. Mary's Seminary, Oscott College, Birmingham, England. He is a frequent contributor to *The Downside Review* on subjects related to the priesthood and the Mass.

Dr. Balthasar Fischer, professor of liturgy at the diocesan seminary of Trier, Germany, is a prominent figure in the modern liturgical movement. Much of his scholarly work has been devoted to a study of the Psalter.

Fr. Clifford Howell, S.J., the well known author and lecturer who at present is stationed at Bourton Hall, Rugby, England, has done a great deal to spread knowledge of liturgy among Catholics in England and America.

Abbé Louis Lochet, whose article on the ends of marriage is digested in this issue, is a professor at the diocesan seminary of Rheims in France.

His Excellency Fidel G. Martínez is the Bishop of Calahorra and La Calzada, Spain. He began his attack on the notion of "ecclesiastical faith" with an article in *Miscelánea Comillas* in 1946. It is an interesting fact that one of Bishop Martínez's closest intellectual associates is Fr. Joseph Aldama, S.J., who is his chief opponent in this controversy.

Fr. Ceslaus Spicq, O.P., is professor of Sacred Scripture at the Dominican scholasticate of La Saulchoir in France. He is an editor of *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* and is a frequent contributor to it and other European theological journals.

Abbé J. Van Camp, of Brussels in Belgium, has long been a student of the character conferred by the Sacraments and its relationship to the priesthood of Christ.

Dr. Ernst W. Zeeden is professor of history at the University of Freiburg im Breisgau. An authority on the history of Lutheranism, he published a book on the subject (Luther und die Reformation im Urteil des deutschen Luthertums) in 1950.

Liturgy and the Teaching Church

Roger Aubert

One of the benefits that has come from modern liturgical studies has been the realization of the close integration of liturgy with the other elements of Christianity. This article by Canon Aubert, which appeared in Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales, *33(1952), pp. 5-16, under the title "Liturgie et magistère ordinaire" discusses the relation of liturgy to the teaching office of the Church.* Questions Liturgiques *is published by the Abbaye du Mont César, Louvain.*

Forty years ago Dom Festugière wrote that the liturgy is "the noblest organ of the ordinary magisterium of the Church." (M. Festugière, *La liturgie catholique,* Maredsous, 1913, p. 121.) This statement perhaps astonished some, even of those who had already recognized the need of freeing the liturgy from that narrow conception which reduced it to the science of religious "ceremonial." At first thought, it seemed difficult to show the relation of the liturgy to the task which belongs to the ordinary magisterium, that is, the teaching and direction of the faithful.

However, Dom Lambert Beauduin, one of the most effective workers in the contemporary liturgical revival, brought to light some clear and thought-provoking declarations of famous theologians. Bossuet, for example, had said: "The principal instrument of the tradition of the Church is contained in her prayers." And Dom Gueranger regarded the authority of the liturgy as "superior to that of the Fathers and theologians,"—and justly so, for tradition transmitted through the medium of public prayer takes on a unanimous, universal, hierarchial, and official character, qualities which give to theological sources (*loci theologici*) their value.

The liturgy, however, does not merely bear witness to dogma as an indication of tradition. It also "popularizes" dogma with consummate pedagogical art, by implanting it in the spirit, the heart, the soul of the faithful. One could define liturgy, then, as "the theology of the people," and better still, "the doctrine spoken by our Mother." (L. Beauduin, *La Piété de l'Eglise,* Montreal, 1947, pp. 67 and 141.)

Far from being pious exaggerations, these expressions are confirmed by the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff. In the encyclical *Quas primas,* on the Kingship of Christ, Pius XI declared: " . . . people are taught the truths of the Faith and brought to appreciate them more effectively by the annual celebration of the sacred mysteries than by official pronouncements of the Church. For such pronouncements usually reach only the few and, for the most part, the learned; feasts reach all the faithful. Pronouncements speak once; feasts speak every year, in fact, forever. The Church's teaching impresses the mind primarily, while her feasts influence both mind and heart, affecting the whole of man's nature. For man is made up of body and soul and needs these external functions. These sacred rites in all

their varied beauty stimulate man to a deeper penetration of the truths God has revealed. Thus they become a part of his very life." (*AAS*, XVII (1925), p. 603.)

Ten years later, the same Pope crystallized this idea in a declaration to the Most Reverend Bernard Capelle: "The liturgy is a very great thing. It is the most important medium of the ordinary magisterium of the Church. . . . The liturgy is not the teaching of this or that person, but of the Church." (Declaration during an audience, Dec. 12, 1935, quoted in *Le vrai visage de la liturgie*, Louvain, 1938, pp. 256 and 258.)

Catholics have for some time been coming to the realization that it would be very desirable to have the liturgy become for modern Christians what it was of old, a vital proclamation of God's Word to the faithful, the best ordinary means of teaching the fundamental truths of faith and their application to daily life. There is no question here of reducing the liturgy to a mere method of pedagogy; the liturgy is before all else a sacramental celebration, a mystery of salvation that prolongs the sacerdotal mission of Christ. But it is the singular richness of the Christian liturgy to be at the same time a sacred mystery and the authentic commentary on that mystery.

The Church is charged with the perpetuation here on earth of the priestly and prophetic mission of Christ. Thus she has a basic duty to teach, a duty which she discharges through the definitions or directives of the Sovereign Pontiff, decrees of Councils, pastoral letters of bishops, sermons given by parish priests, religious conferences, publication of books and magazines, and catechetical instruction.

Now it is undeniable that ecclesiastical documents and even religious works are read by a small minority; that catechism classes and courses in religion reach only children and adolescents. The Church has only one necessary contact with all her children: weekly Mass. The Church has therefore provided that this Sunday gathering should serve as a real "weekly replenishment of Christians," the occasion when the faithful can participate in the source of Eucharistic life and at the same time nourish their minds through contact with the message of Revelation.

But how does the Church conceive this nourishing? Is it to be just a didactic interlude, interrupting for a few minutes a religious ceremony that has no doctrinal meaning? According to Msgr. Chevrot: "The whole question is to know whether this requisite instruction must necessarily take the didactic form of theological manuals adapted to laymen, similar to the teaching we have in our chairs of theology. One may ask whether the liturgy does not offer us an older method, just as effective and complete, for the religious education of the Christian people; whether we do not have in the liturgy a 'catechesis' free of all scholastic terminology, it is true, but all the more popular precisely because it is expressed in a less abstract and technical fashion.

"Not 'popular' in the bad sense of the word, as if it were a question of giving a catechetical summary reduced to a few essential formulae, or a superficial and inferior instruction. Quite the contrary, the Church offers us in the liturgy a catechesis that can make the sublimest truths of Christianity intelligible to all her children, even the most unlettered. In reality, the liturgy, in its rites and in its prayers, as well as by the succession of its feasts, preaches to us the 'Christian mystery.' (Msgr. Chevrot,

"Reflexions à la suite de quelques essais de prédication liturgique," in *Maison-Dieu,* 5, p. 36)

It would be interesting to consider the pedagogical character of the Catholic liturgy of the Sacraments. A sacramental catechesis based on the liturgy would have the enormous advantage of bringing out the true theological meaning of the Sacraments. Under the dominant influence of moralism, this meaning is too often distorted in contemporary teaching. The Sacraments are explained as aids to the observance of the Commandments rather than means of assimilation to Christ and sources of our new life in the Spirit. We shall limit our discussion, however, to the Mass.

First, the Mass teaches by its rites. These, even independently of the sense of the words pronounced, frequently have a power of intellectual suggestion superior to any theoretical instruction. Psychologists have emphasized the importance of gestures and postures in group psychology. This is specially true in religious matters, where there is question of communicating a sense of the sacred, an attitude which can be stirred up, but not taught. Instituted by the Church under the inspiration of the Spirit, the liturgical ceremonies can be thought of as "God's message to men." For example, in a pontifical Mass, the place which the Bishop occupies, the throne on which he sits, his insignia, the ministers attending him, his full gestures, dignified pace—all these constitute a visual instruction, teaching us that the Church is a hierarchy, invested with the plenitude of the priesthood, whose members in the very exercise of worship act as princes of the people. In an ordinary Mass, the fact that the choir is separated from the nave, that the priest wears special vestments, that he presides at the divine service and pronounces the words of the liturgy—these teach us that there is in the Church a priesthood distinct from the laity and taking the place of Christ.

These, however significant, are a matter of purely human technique. There is another element which makes the liturgy of the Mass, within the framework of the Divine Office, the best expression of the "prophetic" function of the Church, of her supernatural magisterium. By the setting given to the scriptural passages used at Mass, the liturgy constitutes the ideal proclamation of the Word of God.

First of all, the liturgy permits that proclamation to take place with a solemnity that brings out its official character, especially with regard to the Gospel. Only the priest or deacon, who by their ordination participate in the priesthood of Christ, may read it at Mass. Note too the marks of respect prescribed by the rubrics on the occasion of this reading.

Next, the liturgy teaches the faithful not to listen passively to the Word of God, but to make it at once their spiritual nourishment and the springboard of their prayer. This the liturgy does through the habitual arrangement of liturgical elements in this order: sacred reading, chant, prayer. The principles inspiring this order may be summed up as follows: "If the community of the baptized assembles, it is not to listen to human opinions, no matter how eloquent or powerful, nor even simply to discover the divine vestiges scattered throughout nature. It is rather to hear the vivifying Word which God has revealed through the inspired writers of the Old and New Testament, and whose propagation and authentic interpretation He has entrusted to the one Church of Jesus Christ. That divine Word calls forth an

echo in the hearts of the faithful which is expressed by a social chant. . . . The filial response thus evoked is then developed in a brief, silent supplication or in a litany which reveals the insistence of the appeal or even tarries to enumerate some intentions common to all, thereby taking on a more urgent character and redoubling its intensity. Finally, the priest's prayer ratifies the congregation's supplication and presents it to God the Father through the only Mediator and Sovereign Priest, Jesus Christ." (H. Chirat, "Elements fondamentaux de la célébration du culte," in *Maison-Dieu,* 20, p. 31.)

The inclusion of the Bible within the liturgy has a third advantage. As Dom Festugière has said: "The Bible is an encyclopedia which is at the same time quite complete and quite unsystematic. Of these two qualities, the first passes over into the service, the other is profoundly modified. In effect, the liturgy does not content itself with appropriating all the most striking passages in Scripture or with stimulating by its rites the reading of Scripture. It also enriches the sacred writings with a good number of doctrinal elements, a fact which should not surprise us, knowing as we do that according to the Catholic view the legacy Christ left to humanity consists less in a library than in a living tradition. Moreover, the liturgy arranges the biblical texts in an orderly way, systematically associates them with a view to inculcating lessons and producing impressions. In a word, it assembles the disjointed members into a harmonious organism." (*Op. Cit.,* p. 125.)

At each return of the liturgical the unity of the divine plan. It will cycle, the Church begins anew the unfolding of her catechesis. She reenacts concretely the main steps of the divine redemptive plan. It can be said that the liturgical year is "the august and permanent proclamation by the Church, of the Word which has been entrusted to her." Although it is a catechesis without equal, the liturgy, because of its very richness, needs some commentary. Since earliest times, the proclamation of God's Word in the liturgy has ended with a homily which calls attention to its chief lessons. Such an integral part of the liturgical ceremony is this homily that, according to the rubrics, when a Bishop celebrates a pontifical Mass, he or his assistant priest is to preach the homily.

It has become customary for the Sunday sermon to be broader in subject matter than formerly, more independent of the Scripture readings from the Mass of the day. This has some advantages, but it is important in this matter to abide by the spirit of the Church, that is, to give the sermon as often as possible a liturgical orientation.

This does not mean that it is to be an archeological explanation of the rubrics. Nor does it mean, though this is of more value, occasional consideration on ceremonies of the Mass. It means presenting the fullness of the Christian mystery, placing within reach of the faithful the rich doctrinal instruction conveyed by the liturgy.

One of the major defects of our usual preaching—and, for that matter, of all our religious instruction—is that we have lost sight of the Christian mystery as the culmination in Christ of the glorious history of divine intervention in the world. Liturgical preaching will bring back that unifying outlook, explaining the annual cycle of feasts of Our Lord which reflects show too in the unifying perspective of the Paschal Mystery, the close

connection that exists between dogma, moral, and the Sacraments.

Another defect of our preaching is that it is generally too abstract and moralizing. Liturgical preaching, explaining the mysteries as the Church does, in concrete form and in an atmosphere of prayer, will arouse vigorous adherence of the whole person to living realities which penetrate the depths of our being, instead of a simple assent of the mind to cold propositions and a system of ideas.

If the principles briefly sketched here can again be put into practice, Catholic preaching will become what it should never have stopped being: the auxiliary to the sublime Christian catechesis which the liturgy ought to be, that liturgy which is, today as yesterday, the most important medium of the ordinary magisterium.

MARY'S COMPASSION

"The Meaning of Mary's Compassion" by Thomas U. Mullaney, O.P., *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXV(1951): 1-6, 120-129, 196-207.

The truth that Mary cooperated with her Son in winning grace for man is rich in meaning. We presuppose that Mary is Coredemptrix in the acquisition of all graces for all mankind, herself excepted, and we shall try to acquire some understanding of the implications of this truth.

Mary was admirably suited for her role since the attributes especially prominent in Christ in the Redemption are clearly reflected in Mary. By formally sharing in her Son's Passion, taken precisely as the price of our Redemption, Our Lady exercised her Coredemptive office.

Analogous to the Passion of Christ, Mary's Compassion was meritoriuos, satisfactory, sacrificial, and redemptive. This truth, taught by many saints and theologians, has been strongly affirmed by recent Popes.

By reason of her surpassing holiness, Mary merited congruously *(de congruo)* what Christ merited condignly *(de condigno)*. Mary's merit surpasses in kind as well as in extent that of all the saints because of her unique holiness, resulting from the most intimate union with Christ as His Mother. Where we can merit individual graces for some few men, Mary merited all graces for all men.

Mary's Coredemption, as a work reparative in nature, was uniquely satisfactory because in consenting to be Mother of God, she aligned her life with that of Christ, whose every work was ordered to reparation. As Mother of God, Mary soars above all other creatures so that there is a stricter propriety in His accepting her works as satisfying than in accepting ours. Since God has willed that all sin should be congruously satisfied for by Mary, it is impossible in the present order for there to be any satisfaction for sin apart from her. Another unique feature of Mary's satisfaction is that, whereas we can congruously satisfy for the punishment due to forgiven sin, she congruously satisfied for sin itself, both original and actual.

By giving birth to and preparing the Victim of Calvary and by surrendering her maternal claims to Him for our salvation, Mary was joined in an ontological and unique way with Christ in His sacrificial work, that is, in placating God by His death. Again, Mary's cooperation in paying the price of Redemption is unique. As Christ's Mother she was capable of co-offering Him as something of herself. By her "fiat" to the Angel Gabriel she consented to be Mother of Christ, *qua* Redeemer. She joined Christ in suffering, whereas John and the holy women could only commiserate Him.

Mary did not, of course, act as a co-cause in her own redemption. Christ's redemptive act, it is true, is one, but it produces a twofold effect: Mary's preservative redemption and our redemption. Our redemption is produced through the cooperation of Mary, predestined by a loving and wise God to be joined with Christ in winning men back to God.

What is a Layman?

Yves M.-J. Congar, O.P.

The reawakening of Catholics in our times to the proper function of the laity in the liturgy and apostolate has suggested the desirability of a more positive answer to the title-question of this article, and has evoked considerable interest in the relatively unworked field of the theology of the lay state. A book by Father Congar on the latter subject will soon be published. This digest represents the first chapter, originally published under the title, "Qu'est-ce qu'un laic?" in an issue of Supplément de la Vie Spirituelle *devoted to the spirituality of the layman (No. 15 [Nov. 15, 1950], pp. 363-392). Other portions of the forthcoming book have appeared in* Irenikon, *Vol. 24 (1951); and the concluding chapter appeared in another issue of* Supplément de la Vie Spirituelle *devoted to the spirituality of the layman (No. 20 [Feb. 15, 1952.])*

The adjective "lay," though not found in Scripture, is derived from the word *laos,* which is used frequently in Scripture to mean the people of God. The first to use the adjective "lay" to distinguish the people from their priests was Clement of Rome. His letter to the Corinthians is the first of a series of texts which afford abundant testimony to a clear distinction in the Church between the clergy and the laity.

In addition to clergy and laity, there has existed from the time of the Apostles a third group, the ascetics and virgins, who were the forerunners of the monastic life that would take definite form around the year 250. By the middle of the third century we can clearly distinguish in the Church the three states of clergy, laity, and monks; and these states were soon given formal canonical existence.

The lay state is that of a Christian who sanctifies himself in the midst of the world. The state of the cleric is defined by reference to the office conferred on him by ordination: service at the altar and the religious ministry of the people. The state of the monk is defined not by his office but by his way of life: a life separated from the world and lived as completely as possible for God.

In theory the distinction between cleric and monk was clear. But in the West, at least, these two states were closely related and even confused with each other. The reason for this can be grouped under three heads: (1) It was most fitting that clerics, pledged to the sacred ministry, should possess that spirit of total dedication to God which was the essence of the monastic life. In some places groups of clerics lived together with their bishop in the manner of a monastic community. And a clerical spirituality developed around the idea that the cleric should seek only the Lord as his inheritance.

(2) The monastic life, especially in the West, had a marked liturgical orientation, with the result that even those who were not ordained often exercised minor functions in the liturgy.

(3) In controversial writings the terms monk and cleric were understood as synonymous.

Thus, by the time of Gratian the threefold division into clerics, monks, and laity had been replaced by the

twofold division into men of worship (clerics and monks) and laity.

It remains true that from a canonical point of view a layman is to be defined by his not being a cleric. But it is also true that in the course of history the lay state has been considered in contradistinction not only to clerics, but also to monks and clerics taken as a group. For this reason we must form our concept of the layman by opposing it to these two concepts: that of the monk (in a broad sense, including clerics) and that of the cleric, in the strict canonical sense.

The Monastic Concept

The lay state is distinguished from the monastic state by its way of life, its means of sanctification. We can say that the monk or cleric is a man freed for sacred things, living in a divine world, devoted to the affairs of God. The layman lives among the things of earth, devoted by his status to human affairs —and he is divided . . . (I Cor. 7:33).

This concept of the lay state, much in favor during the twelfth century, was commonly accompanied by two overtones. First, the lay state was often pictured as a concession to the weakness of human nature, a compromise of the Gospel ideal. For instance, in confirming the Canons of Raitenbach, Urban II wrote: "From the Church's beginnings, two ways of life have been open to the faithful: one to sustain the frailty of the weak, the other to perfect the happy life of the strong . . . "

We cannot deny that this conception is faithful to the Christian tradition and indeed to the nature of things. The full and uncompromised Christian life is that known to tradition as the angelic life, the monastic life in the broad sense. Still, we cannot escape a certain feeling of dissatisfaction with a conception of the Christian life so exclusively dominated by the idea of renunciation, by the idea of the evilness of the world. Does such a concept give full value to all the aspects of the New Testament? From the point of view of a theology of the lay state, one cannot but think that the text has been read a little hastily . . .

The second "overtone" of the twelfth-century concept of the layman was a tendency to deny to him an active role in the order of sacred things. True, clergy and laity were united in the one faith; their distinction in no way affected their unity in the Church. But in this unity there was a dualism which Stephen of Tournai described in this manner: In the same realm, the Church, and under one king, Christ, two peoples, clergy and laity, live two ways of life, spiritual and carnal, within two jurisdictions, divine and human, and under two regimes, priesthood and royalty. The same dualism in unity was expressed by Hugh of St. Victor and his followers under the figure of a body with its two sides.

This is all very well, but it will be permitted to point out certain disadvantages of this view of things. Essentially it fails in so far as it does not mark out for the laity their place and function in the building of the Church—that task which is specifically Christian and which must be achieved in human history, not in a platonic world apart. The call heard by today's laity and the problems confronting them have hardly any place in this easy distribution of roles between the spiritual and "carnal."

Moreover, the anti-hierarchical critics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, who paved the way for the secularistic laicism and ecclesi-

ology of the Reformers, gave this imagery an entirely different interpretation. Instead of speaking of two sides of one body (an image of unity), they will speak of two bodies each having its head (Pope and King). The spirit, however, loves unity, and the reaction in the sixteenth century against this dichotomy went to extremes. On the one side, it tended to make of the Church a church of clerics, a priesthood without laity, and on the other side, to make the Church a church-state dominated by a king, merely an assembly of laity without a priesthood. Among the Reformers of the sixteenth century the Church tended to be simply the city of the laity in its submission to the law of God. And their progeny boast that they restored holiness from the cloister to the world, gave back to temporal activities and especially to the different occupations of men their proper Christian dignity. However, I am not here undertaking an apology of the Middle Ages or a positive exposition of holiness in the lay state.

The Canonical Concept

St. Bonaventure, writing in the thirteenth century, provides us with an example of the more juridical concept of the lay state. The character conferred in holy orders, he says, sets men apart from the body of the laity and sanctifies them for the ministry of the temple; the ordained are called not merely to live the faith and defend it, but to communicate it. As clerics, they have no obligation to renounce worldly goods, though they should overcome any attachment to them.

Here truly was a new point of view. The world had undergone a profound change since the end of the eleventh century and had come much closer to our own. From the synthetic and symbolic intellectualism of the monastic cultural world with its mystical and moral preoccupations it had passed to an analytic and dialectic intellectualism with juridical preoccupations. If "in the eleventh century the accent was put on the monk, not on the priest," in the thirteenth it tended to shift to the prelate and to ecclesiastical power. Hence we derive a notion of the layman which is different from, but complementary to, the preceding notion. From the viewpoint of his way of life, the layman is a Christian who lives in the midst of the world. This distinguishes him from the monk. From a canonical point of view, the layman is one who has no ecclesiastical power either of jurisdiction or (especially) of orders. This distinguishes him not from the monk, but from the cleric.

Notice that in passing from one point of view to the other we have not yet found the positive definition of a layman so much sought after today. The distinctions we have discussed do not make of the layman one who has no sacred activity at all. He does have a sacred function in the Church. If we cannot give a definition, we can sketch at least a description of the lay state, trying by two successive approaches to find the meeting point of the two concepts we have discussed.

First Approach

As members of the people of God, the laity, as well as clerics and monks, are ordered by their state and in a direct fashion to the heritage of the saints. But they do not, like the monks, live simply and exclusively for the things of heaven; and though they are Christians, they have only a very limited power over the strictly ecclesiastical means of life in Christ, for these are the sphere of the clerics.

Although called to the same inheritance as the clerics and monks,

the laity are to attain this end without withdrawing themselves from the march of the world's history. They are to accomplish the work of God in the world, not simply in the sense that before doing the work and achieving the holiness of the religious life they are also to do the work of the world. The laity are in the world as Christians, to produce there the work of God *in as much as that work must be produced in and through the works of the world.* This is necessary; it is God's plan that His work can be produced according to His concept of it only by the layman's truly engaging himself in the birth of the world. This is essential to the work of the Church, and this is why laymen are essential to the Church. To this extent the laity can be said to be less immediately related than the clerics and monks to the common last end of all. But this statement is secondary to the basic truth that the whole people of God is marching as one to the Promised Land.

Second Approach

The layman then is the man for whom, in the work confided to him by God, the reality of things in themselves exists and is of interest. Not so the cleric, or, especially, the monk; to them these things are of interest on account of the relation they bear to God whom they reveal and whom they help man to serve.

The state of the cleric therefore is beset by dangers. His profession of detachment from the things of earth must be sincere and absolutely pure. What a scandal if in reality he is seeking influence, wealth, the power to control secular affairs . . .

But the greater danger is that he may lose respect for the internal truth of things. By his state he is a man who represents the transcendent relations of things to their principle and end; he runs the risk, therefore, of forgetting that these things do exist in themselves, with their proper nature and demands. They are not mere opportunities for affirming the sovereignty of the Principle, not mere means of carrying out a religious program. The transcendent relations that the cleric represents are realized in a historical and sociological Church and through churchmen who employ means taken from sociological and historical life. The cleric is in danger of ordering things in a purely utilitarian manner to the sociological processes of the Church, subordinating them more to certain fixed ideas and to the practical conveniences of the Christian world, than to the essential demands of Christianity. No apologetic or apostolic (?) utility will excuse such cheating "for a good cause."

There was a time when the whole organizations of temporal life was under the sovereign regulation, and within the framework of the Church; all relative realities were in tutelage. However great the benefits that society reaped from this arrangement, it involved a sort of confiscation, a partial alienation of the things of earth, the sciences as well as public affairs. And this tutelage was unduly prolonged in realms in which men had come of age. Recall the treatment of Galileo, given him in the name of Revelation—really in the name of certain fixed ideas mistakenly identified with revealed truth and sane philosophy.

Against this alienation of things to the priesthood of the First Cause have risen the various priesthoods of the second causes—politicians, scholars, philanthropists—to reclaim their rights. This is the true and fundamental meaning of the laical movement and even of the modern world. Consider the well-known words of Lavisse: "To be laical is to give in to ignorance in no field, to believe that life is worth the pain

of living, . . . to refuse to admit that tears are necessary or that suffering is providential, . . . to refuse to entrust to a judge sitting beyond this life the charge of feeding the hungry, . . . of righting injustices . . .; it is to take up arms against evil in the name of justice."

Apart from the flippant and even sacrilegious elements in this passage, what it really says is this: to be laical is to venture, with all the resources at our disposal, upon the pursuit of justice and truth, for which we hunger and thirst, and which is the substance of human history.

Do we conclude then with a laicist definition of the layman? No. But then, in a sense, Yes. For there is both laicism and "laicity," as our Archbishops have said; just as there is scientism and science, Modernism and modernity, clericalism and the Church . . . There is a laicism based on the denial of God or of the supernatural; but there is also a laicality (we shall risk the barbarism) that accepts the supernatural while desiring that reference to the First Cause not dissolve the reality of second causes and the internal truth of all that goes to make up the world and human history. Believing in God, it yet wants to be allowed to believe in things, to respect nature, her laws, her demands; it thinks that if there is need of men dedicated to the Absolute, the one thing necessary, yet the great majority of men must go to God the long way, without by-passing the world and history.

Consider the example of St. Thomas, the Christian genius placed providentially at the point where the ancient world, consecrated and monastic but feudal too, was giving way to the modern, scientific, positive world—placed there to help teach the new world respect for the things of eternal value that the old world held in trust for it. Though of noble family, and a Benedictine oblate as a youth, his first intellectual steps, which were in philosophy and experimental science, would endear him to the "Arts" faculty of Paris as one of their own. Like no one else, he respected not only the ordered unity of things (the most fundamental and universal idea of the Middle Ages) but also the inalienable truth of each specific nature. Though a cleric he could also be called authentically "laic."

For a layman is a man for whom things exist, for whom the truth of things is not swallowed up and destroyed by reference to a higher principle. For him what is to be referred to the Absolute is the very reality of the elements of this world, whose visible form passes away.

OTHER RECENT ARTICLES ON THE LAY APOSTOLATE

Paul Vanier, S.J., "Vocation chrétienne et mission du laïcat," *Relations,* 11(1951), pp. 119-122 ("Virginité et mariage"), 200-203 ("Rédemption et action temporelle"), 227-231 ("Le sens rédempteur de l'action temporelle.") His view is quite different from Congar's.

* * *

A large number of articles have appeared regarding the World Congress of the Apostolate of the Laity (held in Rome in October, 1951) and the address given by Pope Pius XII to the delegates. Three of the best articles are given here.

Documentation Catholique, 47(1951), pp. 1505-1508, 1569-1582. Detailed reports on the principal discussion and conclusions of the Congress.

Roger Aubert, "L'Eglise en marche: le Congrès Mondial . . ." *La Revue Nouvelle,* 14(1951), pp. 576-589. A particularly informative report on the views and attitudes of delegates from different countries, especially on the laity as "instrument" of the hierarchy.

Rémy Montagne, "Le Congrès Mondial . . .," *Supplément de la Vie Spirituelle,* no. 20(Feb. 15, 1952), pp. 80-89. Covers some of the same ground as Aubert, and examines the institutional and psychological obstacles to the lay-apostolic movement.

* * *

Henry Olsen, "Pius XII and the Lay Apostolate," *Clergy Review,* 37(1951), pp. 463-477. This is a documentated synthesis drawn from numerous writings and addresses of the Pope. The main conclusions which Olsen gathers from the papal teaching can be synopsized as follows:

1. Every Christian must be an apostle, not only because of the special needs of our times, but because of the very nature of Christian life.

2. The lay apostolate involves "the widest possible promulgation of all that concerns the Church," the regeneration of the whole of human life: individual, domestic, social, and political.

3-4. Engaged in a spiritual battle, the apostle must be formed spiritually, especially in faith, self-sacrificing love, and attachment to the Church.

5. The chief means of this formation: Catholic family life, deep and continuing religious education, mental prayer, retreats, the sacraments and liturgy.

6. Besides the individual apostolate there is need of the more perfect and more effective apostolate organized under the hierarchy; organization makes possible more careful formation, renewal of zeal, education, perfection of technique.

7. For certain purposes, specialized apostolates are needed, especially the apostolate of the family, the intellectuals, and workers.

"So far as the Church is concerned she has a threefold mission to fulfill for all: to raise up fervent believers to the level of present-day needs, to introduce those who hesitate on the threshold to the warm and salutary intimacy of the hearth, and to lead back those who have separated themselves from religion and whom she cannot abandon to their miserable fate.

An inspiring task for the Church! But it is one rendered more difficult by the fact that, while the Church as a whole has grown greatly, the number of clergy has not increased proportionately. Besides, the clergy must above all keep themselves free for the exercise of the sacred ministry proper to the sacerdotal state, which no one else can do for them.

For that reason, assistance rendered by the laity to the apostolate is an indispensable necessity . . . In matters of religion there is evidence of the profound and efficacious influence of those who are companions in a profession or condition of life. These factors, and others besides, according to the circumstances of places and persons, have opened wider the doors for the collaboration of the laity in the apostolate of the Church . . .

It is certainly not easy to draw an exact line of demarcation showing precisely where the true apostolate of the laity begins . . . The apostolate of the laity, in its proper sense, is without doubt to a large extent organized in Catholic Action and in other forms of apostolic activity approved by the Church; but, apart from these, there can be, and actually are, lay apostles, those men and women who see all the good to be done and the possibilities and means of doing it; and they do it with only one desire: the winning of souls to truth and grace."

Pope Pius XII, Address to World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, October 14, 1951 (translation taken from *The Catholic Mind,* February, 1952.)

Jesus Christ,

REASON FOR FAITH

A. Delhaye, S.D.B., "Jésus-Christ raison de croire selon les apologistes catholiques . . .," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* 27(1951), pp. 5-29.

How prove the truth of Christ's claims and mission? One method is to argue from the fact of Christ Himself, His wisdom and sanctity, and His influence on human history. Father Delhaye studies the nineteenth century development of this apologetic based on Christ which was used to prove that Christ is God, or at least that in virtue of a divine mission He founded His religion which deserves men's adherence.

Two names dominate the history of apologetics in the last century: Lacordaire, who first systematized and consolidated the argument; and Renan, who by his blasphemous book on the life of Christ roused scores of Catholic thinkers to develop and refine the apologetic arguments based on Christ's personality and influence.

Though the work of Lacordaire exerted a profound influence on later Catholic apologetes, he was not strictly a pioneer. Others before him had appealed to Christ's incomparable wisdom, to His mastery of every situation, to the exalted nature of His teaching. The writings of Bossuet and the famous statement of Napoleon I had done much to make men aware of the singular effect that Christ had had on history. It was the genius of Lacordaire to set these arguments in clear, systematic, and convincing form.

Lacordaire constructed a vast but organic argument that took in the three elements of pre-Christian history, the life of Christ, and the history of Christianity. He laid great stress on Christ's evident sincerity, penetrating intelligence, and indomitable will. This argument, in Lacordaire's opinion, is not sufficient to dispel all doubt. But join it to the facts that Christ has been the very soul of the centuries which followed Him and that the expectation of Him dominated the centuries that preceded Him, and one arrives at an inescapable conclusion: this is the work of God.

Renan's *Vie de Jésus* marks the beginning of a great development in Catholic apologetics. Many, angered by Renan's book, rose to defend the personality of Christ, and in doing this they became increasingly aware of the apologetic value of the fact of Christ's life.

In answer to Renan, many apologetes pointed to the inconsistencies in the rationalistic explanation of Christ, inconsistencies that were the inevitable consequence of denying Christ's divinity.

Many others stressed the positive side. Christ's insight and wisdom, the sublimely simple and yet profound nature of His doctrine, the perfect sanctity and moral grandeur of Christ—these are a most striking miracle; they can find no explanation apart from God. Nor can any natural explanation account for the expansion of Christ's Church, which despite the sacrifices it demands of its adherents and the constant and bitter attacks of its enemies has reached to the far corners of the world.

The Different Senses of Sacred Scripture

Joseph Coppens

Modern studies in the development of dogma and the nature of inspiration have awakened new interest in the age-old question: What is the exact meaning, or meanings, of Sacred Scripture? One of the most significant books on the subject is Professor Joseph Coppens' Les Harmonies des Deux Testaments. *Following the second edition of this work in 1949, many theologians accepted the author's invitation to express their views on his position. In response to these observations Coppens wrote the article "Nouvelles reflexions sur les divers sens des Saintes Ecritures,"* Nouvelle Revue Théologique, *74(1952), pp. 3-20, which is here digested. Off-prints of the original article have been published by the* Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, *Bruges, Desclée de Brouwer, 1952.*

When we wrote our *Harmonies des Deux Testaments,* we became involved in a debate of vital importance. Our work became the object of much criticism and discussion by our colleagues. We take the occasion of these observations to clarify our position.

All agree today that the accommodated and allegorical senses have no scriptural value, properly so called. There is essential agreement that the consequent sense is, at least in a wide sense, a true biblical meaning, for it proceeds in a straight line from the inspired word. Virtually included in the inspired word, it must have been seen and intended by God, the principal author. The adjective *consequent* prevents equivocation, for it indicates that the signification is only mediate, deduced with the help of analogies and more or less evident reasoning.

The Typical Sense of Scripture

The first real difficulties arise with regard to the typical sense. Many err in wishing to separate this sense from the words in order to attach it only to biblical realities. But for the reader of the Bible, biblical realities exist only by means of words. It even happens, as in the case of Lazarus and the rich man, that they have only a literary existence. How could a sense in no way related to the words remain scriptural? In other words, we must take account of what is called verbal typism. Although inseparable from the inspired words, the typical sense is attached to them externally by means of the realities which the text expresses and to which Providence has attributed a figurative meaning.

The most important characteristic of the typical sense is that it is realized only by means of a transposition of sense. There where the typical sense intervenes, the literal sense disappears; it becomes a sign, an indication, a figure of realities the letter does not include. This figurative meaning, usually unknown to the sacred writers themselves, has gradually come to the notice of later readers of the Bible by reason of the objective connections established by Providence between the different stages of God's salvific work and progressively manifested by it to believers.

Thus defined, the typical sense is a scriptural idea of precise meaning. Hence it should have a specific ap-

pellation not susceptible to confusion. The classic term *typical sense* suits it perfectly and should not be given another meaning or extended so as to include the preterliteral senses denoted by the word *spiritual* taken in the broadest acceptation of the word.

Great progress has been made with respect to the use and criteria of the typical sense. No one wishes to revive all of patristic typology. The most acceptable and safest biblical types are the least artificial. The following criteria are proposed: a real similtude between the type and the antitype; agreement of particular types with the general typology of the Old Testament; the support of the New Testament and now and then of the Old Testament itself; the concurrence of a truly imposing number of Fathers; and, finally, in extraordinary cases, the insight of some ecclesiastical writer, *omni exceptione maior,* in the role of spokesman for the Church.

Because of its transposition of meaning, the typical sense borders on the frontiers of allegory, and it is easy to pass from one domain to the other. Each time one engages in typology beyond the limits traced by Sacred Scripture itself or by the Fathers, he enters the realm of allegory. Father Danielou would distinguish these two domains by the norm of the Christological sense. However, he understands Christology in such a wide sense that almost all theology can be found there. Moreover, the history of exegesis has proved that such a typology is not free from error and fantasy.

However, we do agree with Danielou that typology deserves more emphasis than critical exegetes generally give it. Exegesis itself requires this. We are thinking much less of detailed typological agreement between the two Testaments than we are of the grand frescoes sketched by the New Testament writers when, for example, they conceive the redemption as a new exodus, or transpose to the Christian scheme the feast of expiation. Moreover, typology finds its place at the very heart of the Old Testament each time the prophets have been conscious of speaking of supreme realities in figures and images.

On the other hand, some authors endeavor to give typology the leading role, asserting that the Bible is not so much an object of science as a bread of life for Christians, not only because of certain verses which in their literal sense are of great value, but by reason of every bit of its content. However, they continue, the entire Bible cannot fulfill this function unless the reader can easily discover throughout its contents the presence of Christ.

Assiduous use of the Bible is sufficient to prove the inaccuracy of these presuppositions. It is an illusion to believe that typology is not a matter of science; or that it furnishes the simple faithful, without recourse to erudition, the key to the Scriptures; or that it discloses in all texts the anticipated presence of Jesus Christ. The champions of this theory themselves bring forth restrictions, satisfied if this disclosure of Christ amounts to a revelation of events of Messianic times, or of the great categories upon which our theology must be based, or at least of a theology of history. They want to put a new meaning into all of the Old Testament, as if it did not suffice that an inspired work impress the reader by a conclusion or by a series of moral and dogmatic lessons. In Semitic literature especially, where superfluity is the fashion, one must attend to the over-all teaching of the work.

The Fuller Sense of Scripture

The problem of the fuller sense has received the most attention from our readers. Some raise anew the question of a plurality of literal senses and say that since this fuller sense transcends the literal sense it must differ from it or cease to be. We answer that the fuller sense does not supersede the literal sense pure and simple, but only that sense which our imperfect means of philological investigation permits us to obtain. The true fuller sense is the addition or complement of meaning which God, the author of Scripture, posesses, and with which He directs the inspiration and eventually the revelation of the sacred text. There is question therefore of a prophetical-full sense which differs from the philological-historical sense quantitatively rather than qualitatively. The immediate literal sense is not changed but more deeply penetrated.

The question arises how God can include a sense in the words of His instrument without this instrument being conscious of this sense. First of all, we can suppose that in extraordinary cases, by reason of the charisms of prophecy or mysticism, the sacred writer has participated in a vision of the fuller sense in a supernatural way. Then there is Cardinal Newman's theory which claims for certain biblical passages a special kind of verbal inspiration. All unknown to himself, the writer is influenced to choose words adapted to convey a divine thought more profound than his own, or words which in the course of time, by means of progressive revelation, receive a fuller meaning. Finally, in the hypothesis of the fuller sense, there is produced a knowledge analogous to that of the typical sense. The hagiographer is placed in contact with the divine realities before he produces them in writing. Therefore, these divinely revealed realities have been attained in two ways. From a literary point of view they are somehow cast in the terms of the writer and in the notions these terms express. But before this, they have been grasped by an intuition to which corresponds the simple literary designation of the object. Obviously, the realities surpass and go beyond their literary portrayal. The better they are understood, the more they will illumine by successive reflections the original sketch, necessarily imperfect and inadequate.

The fuller sense is a real sense, joined to the literary sense and resulting from a grasp of the reality by the illumined mind of the writer. It resembles the consequent sense, which also supersedes the immediate literal sense, and the typical sense, which derives not only from the text, but also from biblical realities. Unlike the consequent sense, it does not depend on syllogisms but on a deepening of the immediate sense. Later meanings were already present in germinal form from the beginning because of the content left there by the charism of prophecy. There is no real multiplicity of meaning but a progress of knowledge within the same literal sense.

Objections to the Fuller Sense

Some critics maintain that the sole occupation of an exegete is to discover, with the help of philology, literature, history, and the science of criticism, what the author wanted to say. The divine thought in becoming incarnate in the text is subject to the laws which govern human discourse, and to disconnect it from these texts is to condemn oneself from the beginning to comprehend nothing.

We agree that it is not for the scientific exegete to detect the fuller

sense. That belongs to the Magisterium, the interpreter of the designs of the Spirit. Its presence once indicated, it is not forbidden the exegete to inquire how, in a particular case, the fuller sense harmonizes with the immediate literal sense, in order to fill up as much as possible every hiatus between the conclusions of the sacred science and the pronouncements of the Magisterium.

It is also objected that the fuller sense is contrary to the Thomistic notion of inspiration whereby Scripture and all its meanings are the result of the joint operation of God and His instrument. When the sacred writer ceases to play his part, there is no longer any Sacred Scripture.

The Thomistic School itself furnishes us a refutation of this argument by its notion of instrumental cause. Precisely because the hagiographer has elaborated his work as an instrument, the work surpasses the effects, assimilable to his own proper action. Scripture, therefore, possesses a plenitude of meaning which goes beyond that which the human author as such could have placed there as principal cause.

Let us add that the principle of instrumentality does not require that the fuller sense be found in every passage of Scripture. The instrumental effect looks to the whole, and it suffices that it reach all the parts in their relation to the whole.

It is frequently difficult to distinguish nicely between the fuller sense and the consequent sense, especially when the latter is obtained by a simple explanation of the terms with the help of biblical themes and without recourse to philosophical analysis. Let the name *consequent sense* be reserved for conclusions from non-scriptural reasonings, and *fuller sense* for those of a biblical nature. When new revelations result in a deeper understanding of the literal sense, these more recent passages from Scripture do not create the fuller sense but only contribute to its understanding.

Finally, our opponents are inconsistent when they affirm, on the one hand, that the hagiographer has fully conceived and adequately expressed the divine reality, and, on the other, that the literal sense contains a depth of meaning which the collation of parallel and convergent scriptural texts brings to light. It should be easy to admit that this plenitude of meaning remained hidden to the first readers of the Bible. Why not call this meaning, virtually present from the beginning but later manifested by new light, the fuller sense?

To sum up, the fuller sense is the additional meaning which the unity and progress of revelation invite and oblige us to include in the literal sense of certain scriptural texts. A theological sense sanctioned by the Magisterium, it serves to bridge any gap between the sources of revelation and the actual teaching of the Church. Thus theologians have been justified in hunting out certain texts upon which to found the doctrine of the Assumption. The bull *Munificentissimus Deus* and its commentaries are of such a nature as to justify this sense and to favor its recognition by both exegetes and theologians.

Spiritual Sense of Scripture

In the final chapter of his work *Histoire et Esprit,* Henri de Lubac wishes to reintroduce a spiritual sense. By an interior illumination of the soul amounting to a true charism of interpretation, God speaks to the reader and awakens in him thoughts of wisdom and spiritual edification. Only thus is

the true purpose of Scripture realized: to be, along with the Eucharist, and without the help of human science, a bread of life for all the faithful.

In our view this is not a true scriptural sense, but rather a new kind of pious accommodation. However, as long as there is no danger of false mysticism, we admit that God can thus enrich one's spiritual life. Perhaps even the fuller sense is thus obtained by what approximates an intuition. But to insist on the value and necessity of the spiritual meaning thus understood is to risk the dangers of individualism.

Let us terminate these reflections with an outline that groups systematically the different scriptural senses.

Proper Senses of Scripture

A. Literal and Immediate Sense
   1. Immediate literal sense (philological-historical)
   2. Fuller literal sense (prophetical-literal or philological-theological)

B. Literal and Mediate Sense
   Consequent sense

C. Typical Sense
   1. Historical-verbal typical sense (The realities on which the typism is based have an historical existence.)
   2. Verbal typical sense (The realities have a purely literary existence.)

Senses Attributed to Scripture

By either a purely literary artifice or under the influence of religious experience.

A. Allegorical Sense
B. Accommodated Sense

No one should still doubt that the immediate literal sense is the most important. If he does, it is because he longs to return to Origen or Philo; or because he refuses to admit, in spite of the evidence itself, and in spite of the Thomistic notion of inspiration and the theory of literary genres, that many texts in the Old Testament possess a permanent message only insofar as they are viewed in a totality and subordinated to the whole. This will not impoverish the Bible, for the fundamental beliefs that it treats can never be exhausted.

SENSES OF SCRIPTURE AND THE ENCYCLICALS

In connection with the preceding article by J. Coppens, an article that merits attention is "Le sens plenier et les encycliques" by F. M. Braun, O.P., in *Revue Thomiste,* 51(1951), 294-304. The author maintains that neither the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* of Leo XIII nor Benedict XV's *Spiritus Paraclitus* provides a basis for the doctrine of the "fuller sense"; but that the latest scriptural encyclical, Pius XII's *Divino afflante Spiritu,* does give such a foundation.

Fr. Braun bases his opinion on the following evidence. Two years before the appearance of the encyclical, the Biblical Commission issued a letter which equated the spiritual and typical senses of Scripture: "un senso spirituale o tipico." The parallel passage in the encyclical follows this letter quite closely, but it does not equate "spiritual" with "typical." What it does is: 1) oppose the spiritual sense to strict literal meaning and to the accommodated sense, 2) refer the spiritual sense to both words and actions *(dicta vel facta),* 3) say that God alone intended the spiritual sense.

Arguing from these points, Fr. Braun draws his conclusions regarding the *fuller sense.* It is likely that by omitting the equation of "spiritual" with "typical"

the encyclical wished to give "spiritual" a wider meaning. The spiritual meaning is opposed to literal meaning as that which was known and intended by God alone in contrast to what was intended and expressed by the human author. When it says that happenings *(facta)* could have a deeper and prophetic meaning which God alone could know the encyclical points to the typical sense. But the encyclical refers the spiritual meaning not only to happenings but to words *(dicta)*. In doing this, it seems to teach that the meaning of certain inspired words went beyond the comprehension of the inspired writer and were intended only by the principal author of Scripture. This is exactly what is meant by the *fuller sense.*

If this is true, one can conclude that the notion of spiritual sense has been extended to give some official status to a scriptural meaning which is neither strictly literal, nor typical, nor accommodated.

Apart from the accommodated sense, the meanings of Scripture can be divided on this basis: was the meaning intended by the human author (literal sense) or only by God (spiritual sense)? The literal sense is subdivided into properly literal or figurative dependent upon the intention of the human author. The spiritual sense is subdivided into the typical sense, which deals with the deeper meaning which God intended happenings to convey, and the *fuller sense,* which pertains to the deeper meaning which God intended to be attached to certain words.

Fr. Braun goes on to confirm his argument by a letter written in 1950 by Dom A. Miller, secretary of the Biblical Commission, and to correlate his conclusions with the teaching of St. Thomas on the subject.

SUBJECTS TO BE TREATED IN COMING ISSUES

Tradition, its relation to Scripture as a font of Revelation.

Reasons for keeping Latin in the liturgy.

Morality of medical experimentation on human beings.

Progress in the interpretation of Sacred Scripture.

New principle in the development of mariology.

Act of faith, the Catholic answer compared to that of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner.

Social function of private property.

Missiology and the increased emphasis on catholicity of the Church.

Role of the intellect in the act of love.

A Catholic scientist's view on evolution.

The Ends of Marriage

Abbé Louis Lochet

"Can the opinion of certain modern writers be admitted, who either deny that the primary end of marriage is the generation and education of children, or teach that the secondary ends are not essentially subordinate to the primary end, but are equally principal and independent?" In March, 1944, the Holy Office answered this question negatively. The following article essays an answer to certain questions which the decree left open. The article was written in 1947 and originally appeared under the title "Les fins du mariage," in Nouvelle Revue Théologique, *73(1951), pp. 449-465, 561-586.*

The following study is written along the same lines as several other works which have been published apropos of Dr. Dom's *Du sens et de la fin du marriage.* It does not pretend either to defend his thesis, or precisely to refute it, but simply to continue, without polemical intent, the study of the order and the hierarchy of the ends of marriage.

One might think, it is true, that the decree of the Holy Office of March 29, 1944, had brought to a close, once and for all, discussions concerning Doms's theses. We do not think so. We believe, rather, that decrees of this type barricade devious routes, not to stop us on our journey, but to help us in our advance along the right path, and that only by understanding these decrees correctly can we make progress.

Morever, the Magisterium itself brings both phases of the problem before us. Besides speaking of procreation as the primary end, Pius XI, in *Casti Connubii,* says that if one considers marriage in a wider sense as a familiar sharing of life together, then truly one may speak of mutual perfection as a primary reason and cause.[1] He speaks thus and sees no contradiction between these two statements.

In what follows we hope to show how to establish a harmonious synthesis between the orientation which looks to the personal development of the marriage partners in a community of persons, and that other orientation which declares the primacy of procreation and education in marriage as a society. Into this synthesis we will also try to incorporate without distortion several elements of modern thought.

I. Guiding Principles on the Finality of Societies.

The words of Pius XI on marriage suggest a distinction imposed on all human societies, a distinction which directs from above the hierarchy of their ends. We refer to the distinction between society and community.

A few words will clarify what we mean. The finality of every society lies on two different levels. For example, a factory has as its productive goal a material good which defines it as a society. Now this productive work also unites men in a community of mutual knowledge, respect, and friendship, the bonds of which transcend time and can be elevated supernaturally in Christ; and this intimacy of persons is also an end of their gathering together in society. Thus we have two interrelated levels of finality: the temporal level, characterizing society by its material product, and a higher level with a finality transcending temporal goods. This higher finality tends to form a human community, a union in which each gives himself to all and

all to each through ties of spiritual love.

Now, before we apply these ideas to marriage, consider for a moment the bases of this double finality, which are in human nature itself. For human nature to achieve the fullness of its destiny two things are necessary: first there is need of a multiplicity of individuals in order that the rich possibilities of human nature, unrealizable in a single individual, may be realized, and that each man may understand better the nature that is incompletely manifested in himself; and secondly, these riches must be related to the ends of a person; there must be communion of men in friendship, the friendship of the sons of God loving Him in His image in each other. In other words there must first be diversification through procreation, and then communion and unification; there must be the society, a temporal reality with a temporal end, completed in time, and the community, established among persons for the love of God, realized completely in eternity.

Although there is a distinction here, there is no physical separation. In the social order everything is oriented toward the community, and throughout, the attractive goodness of God is drawing all things to Himself, giving life to societies and forming the community. Moreover, there is a real interdependence of another sort. The mutual relations of members in a society are intertwined with the invisible intimacy of persons in the community. The exchange of particular goods, the proper object of social life, invites an extension of love to the person himself, which in turn leads to mutual love in God. Hence one can say that because of these interrelationships the society is eternalized in the community.

II. The Finality of Marriage.

1) The Snythesis to be Established.

Like every human group, the family is at once a society and a community; but to specify it as a society one cannot invoke its end as a community. This would be to confuse the two levels of finality which we have carefully distinguished.

The Social Ends of Marriage.

Now considering it as a society, what ends do we find? The primary specifying end of marriage as a society is the procreation and education of children. Since we are concerned here not only with the conservation of the species in time, but also with an action ordered to the formation of persons, education enters directly into the consideration of this end. Furthermore, the secondary social end of marriage is the temporal development of the marriage partners. The tie binding them permanently is not just for the children; it is for husband and wife, to help them toward the complete development of their humanity.

Within this secondary end theologians distinguish two elements: mutual help and the allaying of concupiscence. And here it is that science provides deeper insight through its discoveries about the far-reaching influence of sex. From science we know that the mutually complementary character of the two sexes plays its part not just by way of external help in the management of the household or by way of check to the disorders of the flesh, but by contributing to the balance and harmony in the whole of human life, in its physical, affective, and moral aspects; and that the conjugal act has for its direct physical effect not only the procreation of the child but also the psycho-physiological enrichment of the marriage partners.

Marriage as a Community.

Finally we come to view marriage as a union of persons and to consider its end as a community. But a difficulty presents itself. If procreation and education are made the end-all and be-all of marriage, does not one risk the charge of subordinating persons, as such, to a social good? This cannot be allowed, however exalted the social good. Therefore, to render to conjugal love and its acts their true dignity are we to say that they are ordered solely to giving expression and vitality to the love of husband and wife? If we do, we will only raise a new difficulty: for how can the child be ordered to the development of his parents? In him too there is a personal value that cannot be ordered absolutely to another thing. The difficulty disappears if one admits that all the social realities of marriage are ordered to express and to realize a communal end which transcends and integrates them. Thus the temporal social ends lead to an eternal community of love. It can perhaps be said that failure to distinguish between these two levels of finality, the social and the communal, is the cause of all the confusion concerning this subject.

2) Confusions to Avoid.

In pursuing this analysis one must first avoid confusing the mutual temporal help of the marriage partners with the end of marriage as a community. If one conceives the mutual help as identical with the union between the persons, it is impossible to make it a secondary end, for it is true that this union of persons transcends all social ends. Likewise, lowering the importance of the community to the level of temporal ends disturbs the harmony of these ends. Mutual help would thus no longer be ordered to the procreation and education of children, but inversely, the generation of the child would be ordered to the development of the parents; the order of social ends would be subverted: marriage would be ordered to an intimacy of persons, but only between parents, whereas in reality this community essentially looks toward the children. The basis of this community lies in all the social bonds of the family: the bonds derived from the mutual help of the parents as well as those which spring up between them and their children through generation and education. The truth then is that not only the conjugal union is to be elevated to the height of a community of persons, but family life in its entirety. All the ties of society weave between persons a communion of love in which all, in giving themselves to all, share in common all the riches of their humanity in a common spirit directed to God.

But there is also a second confusion to avoid. We must not reduce the entire finality of marriage to the order of social ends, of which the primary is procreation. That some writers have done so in reaction to recent errors is understandable, but too much stress on the procreative end makes it difficult to understand the dignity of the person. For friendship of persons is an *end*. Love can be ordered only to greater love. And so the union of persons is not a social end; it is something beyond the social ends, transcendent to them yet immanent in them, unifying without changing; it is their soul, their principle of vitality.

Thus do we reconcile the two points of view expressed by Pope Pius XI. We see that marriage has its primary and secondary social ends, and that all these social ends, all these temporal ties are ordered to the community of persons in which parents and children advance

together toward the supreme Good, their eternal destiny.

III. Foundations in Tradition, Modern Thought, Applications.

It is now our purpose to show that what we have said is in agreement with the thought of St. Thomas and St. Augustine.

1. St. Augustine

It is necessary to study St. Augustine because of the work he did in outlining the principles underlying the theology of marriage. For Augustine, marriage was considered to be a preparation for the Heavenly City. As part of this preparation, it filled out the number of the elect, promoted sociability and friendship, and united different families.

But St. Augustine did not often speak of the "ends" of marriage. Rather, he preferred to speak of the "goods" of marriage. His problem was to avoid both the excess of the Manicheans, who saw marriage as evil, and the excess of Jovinian, who considered marriage to be as good as virginity. According to some texts, it would seem that the essential and indeed the only good of marriage is procreation. But in other texts, Augustine definitely talks of fidelity and the intimacy of the spouses as a good of marriage. And this good gives such value to the marriage bond as to make the marriage a true one—thus for example the marriage of St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin.

As a matter of fact, this example and the idea of marriage as a preparation for the Eternal City point to a reversal of values. Perhaps fidelity and the spiritual union of souls are the primary ends of marriage. Reading St. Augustine, one experiences this tension between the two sets of goods, but apparently Augustine was not aware of this conflict.

His task was to uncover the goods of marriage. He did not see the problem as we do—as a problem of *ordering* the diverse goods. One obstacle that stood in his way was the fact that his philosophy did not give him an insight into the proper relation of matter to form—of flesh to spirit.

2. St. Thomas

Aristotle's philosophy, as assimilated by St. Thomas, could give a clear idea of the relationship between the flesh and spirit. One fundamental principle of Aristotle was that Nature seeks the conservation and preservation of the species. In order to preserve the species man must marry and stay married. Secondarily, and only secondarily, nature has made man and woman complementary and helpful to each other; but it has so made them because they are destined to live together for the sake of procreation; to reject procreation is to vitiate marriage essentially, to make the contract null. This philosophical orientation gave St. Thomas a foundation on which to build a synthesis of the ends of marriage, but it is necessary to mention certain Thomistic ideas that gave an entirely new tone to the themes of Aristotle.

First of all, the idea of the procreative end of marriage is infinitely exalted above the notion of the conservation of the species. To generate children is to people the earth with men who are destined to be the children of God for eternity. Secondly, the mutual aid of husband and wife is not limited to this earth—they are to assist each other to reach heaven. Thirdly, St. Thomas corrects Aristotle on the notion of sex relations. St. Thomas knew that human nature was subject to the effects of original sin.

The Thomistic view, however, has not met with universal approval.

Some, with Doms, think that Thomas, influenced by the biological errors of his time, emphasized the specific, social ends of marriage to the neglect of the personal ends. Others, like Schahl, think that St. Thomas conceded too much to Augustinian pessimism and did not appreciate the human import and moral value of sexual relations.

We think that St. Thomas had all the principles necessary for a correct synthesis of the ends of marriage. For instance, he held that love and union of souls was an end of marriage, and that this love imposes finality on the sex acts. Therefore, we are not doing him violence or indulging in dialectical acrobatics when we introduce these personalist perspectives into a Thomistic synthesis of the ends of marriage.

3. Doctor Doms

Two things led Doms to his theory: scientific discoveries and a trend of philosophical thought. Science has shown that the relations of the sexes are ordered not merely to generation but to the mutual enriching of the partners. This is the personal end of marriage, and in the conjugal act the secret ontological unity of the spouses is realized. The child is merely a biological end of marriage except insofar as a child may contribute to the development of the parents.

In this scheme of things, the child is extrinsic to marriage—a misconception that the Church wishes to guard against. This error arises from confusing the "mutuum juvamen" (a social temporal end) and the "community of persons" (a transcendent finality). To get the proper concept it is necessary to establish the distinction between the plane of social ends (where procreation is the primary end) and the plane of personal ends where the love of persons is the primary end.

4. Moral and Spiritual Applications.

These principles have a very practical application. To consider procreation as the only end of marriage would be to tend toward a moral rigorism. Older people would not be permitted to marry, nor would the conjugal act be permitted when it could not result in generation. At the other extreme, those who consider the spiritual intimacy as the most perfect end of marriage sometimes fail to account for the demands of the procreative ends of marriage.

The hierarchy of ends which we have established should help us to determine the mean. Matrimonial consent involves a total gift of the partners in a society whose end is procreation and mutual aid. These are essential. But still this marriage as a society is ordered to the intimacy of the partners in a community of persons. Thus the marriage of older persons is a true marriage—imperfect perhaps as a society, but perhaps perfect as a community. Even those who voluntarily renounce conjugal acts must still consent to the total gift of themselves in marriage. But because this society is ordered to a higher union, they may renounce certain of their rights in order to enter more directly into the spiritual union. This is a special vocation.

These special vocations serve to point out the higher spiritual community of marriage—showing how husband and wife are to be companions for eternity. And this perspective enables us to find new meaning in the humble actions of daily life, a perspective that sees the whole family life as ascending to heaven. In this light all separation, suffering, and death are to be explained.

It is important to correct the notion that the union of the flesh marks the highest point in the intimacy of the spouses. It is rather a sign of and preparation for the union of souls, just as marriage itself is an image of Christ and His Church, an image of God's gift of grace and of man's acceptance.

1. "This mutual inward moulding of husband and wife, this determined effort to perfect each other, can in a very real sense, as the Roman Catechism teaches, be said to be the chief reason and purpose of matrimony, provided matrimony be looked at not in the restricted sense as instituted for the proper conception and education of the child, but more widely as the blending of life as a whole and the mutual interchange and sharing thereof." *Casti Connubii, (On Christian Marriage)*, Paulist Press edition, p. 8, n. 24.

RELATED ARTICLES ON MARRIAGE

The only comment on Lochet's article that we have seen thus far is the brief review by J. Fuchs, S.J., in *Scholastik*, 26(1951), pp. 578-580, devoted to this article and to C. Schahl, O.F.M., *La doctrine des fins du mariage dans la théologie scholastique* (Paris, 1948). Fuchs takes exception to both Lochet's and Schahl's accounts of the doctrines of St. Augustine and St. Thomas. He maintains that Lochet leaves unanswered the question: "Are not the matrimonial community and love at the same time the source of all that goes by the name of mutual complementing of the marriage partners, and therefore also of service to the offspring?"

* * *

Pope Pius XII has recently given three addresses that bear on the subject:

September 19, 1951, to a group of parents, on the preparation of young people for marriage.

October 29, 1951, to a group of midwives, on divine laws pertaining to procreation and on the opportunities of apostolic midwives to protect the rights of the unborn and the newborn, and to inculcate right attitudes towards the ends and use of marriage.

November 26, 1951, to family associations, largely on two points in the October address that had been misinterpreted in the press: the respective rights of mother and foetus, and the use of the sterile period.

* * *

Benoît Lavaud, O.P., "Pie XII, docteur du mariage," *Revue Thomiste*, 52(1952), pp. 119-141. On the October, 1951, address (above), with references to the September and November addresses and to other papal statements. Cf. same author, "Chronique," *ibid.*, pp. 461-469.

Franz Hurth, S.J., *Periodica*, 40(1951), pp. 402-432. On the October and November addresses, with numerous references to other official documents and private writings on these subjects.

E. P. Ennis, S.J., "The Ends of Marriage," *Clergy Review*, 37(1952), pp. 270-281. On Doms, Kempel, and Canon 1013.

William Conway, "The Recent Papal Allocution [November, 1951]: the Ends of Marriage," *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 19(1952), pp. 75-79. On the 1944 decree and the writings that provoked it.

L. Azzollini, S. J., "L'iniziazione dei Giovani al matrimonio nell' ansia del Papa," *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 103.2 (1952), pp. 449-458. Based on the September and October addresses. Need for timely, even early introduction of young people to the meaning of marriage, and for discipline of all their faculties to fit them for it; hazards to avoid, e.g., in theories that encourage hedonistic view of marriage or discount the dignity of celibacy.

THE LAYMAN IN GOD'S DESIGN

An interesting article that treats the question "What is a layman?" in a somewhat different way than does Father Congar (Cf. page 8) was published in *Eglise Vivante,* 4(1952), pp. 155-181. Entitled "Le laic chrétien dans le dessein de Dieu," it appeared under the authorship of Antoine Chavasse, Henri Denis, and Jean Frisque, S.A.M.

The article begins with a brief theology of history. God's constant and loving gift of Himself to men is the ultimate and transcendent principle of historical unity. Along with this gift of Himself, God gives men liberty, the ability to reply to this divine love.

In addition to the supernatural aspect of creation which is concerned with the loving inter-communication between God and man, there is a subordinate aspect of creation: the whole natural level of things. Equipped with freedom, man strives to dominate this natural level and bring its forces to serve his free will; man works to achieve civilization. This quest is the second and subordinate principle of historical unity.

Human freedom, which permits the return of divine love, also permits man to refuse God's advances. Man has sinned, and his sin has had a tremendous impact on the history of religion and the history of civilization. Man's religious history is now one of redemption. Its great turning point is the coming of Christ, when eternity broke into the course of terrestrial history. God's gift of self to man is not simply love, it is redemptive love that constantly works to win man back to God.

Sin, the enemy of God, has been the great disturbing force in the work of civilization. Man has not expanded his liberty in response to the love of God, but has instead limited his spiritual aspirations to earthly horizons. In a monstrous idolatry, man has taken himself as his goal, and his civilization has become buried in earthliness. By losing sight of God, civilization has lost sight of the true notion of man; because man's liberty has not developed in the realm of religion, the real meaning of liberty has been forgotten.

Human life is dominated by two spiritual aspirations: the quest for God and the quest for civilization. While remaining distinct, these two drives of the human spirit form a unity; they are the natural and supernatural aspects of God's work, and they assist one another. Man rears a civilization so that he can respond to God's supernatural summons, and true religious life gives correct orientation to the temporal aspects of life.

It is the urgent and delicate task of Catholics today to safeguard both the relative autonomy and the ultimate unity of these two dimensions of human activity. Unless this is done, unless faith comes in to orientate civilization, modern civilization will lapse into complete secularism. The Catholic layman must consecrate himself to the work of civilization, to attain the temporal goals which are part of God's work.

While the priest should also keep in close touch with the progress of civilization, his proper function is to see that the supernatural goals of life are attained. It is the Catholic layman who must work to promote civilization itself and help direct it to those natural ends which are truly human. In virtue of the radical reorientation which living Catholicity gives to human life, the lay Catholic gives powerful assistance to civilization in forming men who are truly men. Thereby he disposes men for the grace of God and renders them ready to reply to the divine love. This is the apostolic vocation of the Catholic layman today. If he is unfaithful to it, the Church will suffer great harm. A great apostolic opportunity will be lost.

The Sacramental Character:
ITS ROLE IN THE CHURCH

Abbé J. Van Camp

Exactly what is the function of a layman in the Church's life? In attempting to give an adequate reply to this question, theologians are turning to a more careful study of the sacramental character. This article by Abbé J. Van Camp, which appeared in Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales, *32(1951), pp. 148-155 under the title "Mystère de l'Eglise et Caractères sacramentels," is one of the most recent treatments of the subject.*

It is impossible to lead a complete Christian life by merely fulfilling the minimum requirements of the Church in regard to the sacraments. It is likewise impossible for Christ Himself to live on in His Mystical Body and in the Eucharistic Body, the two-fold prolongation of His Incarnation, without the co-operation of the baptized, the confirmed, the priests, and the bishops; in brief, without the hierarchy of the Church signed with the indelible imprint of the sacramental character.

I. The Mystical Body and the Sacramental Character

The Character and Participation in the Priesthood of Christ.

The encyclical *Mediator Dei* has reminded us that even lay Christians, by reason of the baptismal character imprinted on their souls, share, in lay degree, in the Priesthood of Christ. This statement simply reiterates the classical doctrine on the sacramental character, particularly as found in St. Augustine and St. Thomas.

St. Augustine treats at great length (*Epist.* 98, 5; *PL* 33, 362) the effects produced by the character of Christ (*character dominicus*), or the indelible seal of the Redeemer (*signaculum redemptoris*). He compares it to the branding of sheep or soldiers: just as the shepherd brands his sheep and the general imprints the military mark (*nota militaris*) on the forehead of his men, so Christ, the new Adam, imprints His indelible mark on our souls. This mark of the sacramental character is a victorious rejoinder to the mark of original sin. It joins the Christian to Christ, and Christians with each other. It restores the relation to the Holy Trinity which we had lost by the sin of Adam.

St. Thomas, developing the teaching of St. Augustine, emphasizes our consecration and deputation to the cult of the Blessed Trinity which the sacramental character confers. He conceives the character as giving us a new relation to the Trinity by making us participate in the Priesthood of Christ: "The whole rite of the Christian religion derives from the Priesthood of Christ. It is clear that the sacramental character is the character of Christ; for we are conformed to His Priesthood by the different sacramental characters, which are nothing else than participations in the Priesthood of Christ" (*S.T.*, III, 63, 3).

The Council of Trent does not mention the participation in the

Priesthood of Christ when it treats of the sacramental character, but this omission is easily explained by the fact that it would have been inopportune at the time of the Protestant denial of any hierarchical difference among Christians. Today, however, there is no longer any danger of misunderstanding the teaching that Christians have by baptism a common title to a share with Christ in His Priesthood.

The Character and Membership in the Church

The sacramental character cannot incorporate us into the Priesthood of Christ without also incorporating us into His Mystical Body. By causing the very life of Christ to flow in us, it unites us to one another to form the great family of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that is, the Mystical Body of Christ as described in the writings of St. Paul and St. John.

Already at the end of the last century, Nicholas Gihr pointed out that our incorporation into the Mystical Body of Christ comes about precisely by means of the sacramental character. It also follows as a conclusion from *Mystici Corporis* that it is the character, and not grace as such, which determines our membership in the Church. Not every grave sin separates us from the body of the Church. It is not the loss of grace, but heresy, schism, and apostasy that are opposed to the unitive forces of the sacramental character.

The Indelibility of the Character and the Indefectibility of the Church

In addition to the unitive force of the sacramental character, we must also consider its indelibility. The latter, we believe, is closely related to the indefectibility of the Church, as we can easily prove by recalling the controversy of St. Augustine with the Donatists.

Donatus, an African bishop, wished to set up his African church in opposition to the Roman Church. He argued that the Church of Christ is the society of just men only: the sinner is no longer a Christian; the sacraments cannot be administered validly except by priests and bishops who are in the state of grace. St. Augustine exposed the absurdity of such a doctrine: the sanctity of the Church cannot be built on so frail a foundation as the personal sanctity of its members; the indefectibility of the Church cannot depend on the state of grace, which can be lost at any time; only the indelibility of the sacramental character, a participation in the Priesthood of Christ, can assure the indefectibility of the Mystical Body of Christ.

The sacraments of the structure of the Mystical Body, then, are those which imprint a character. The baptized, the confirmed, and for an even more basic reason, the priests and bishops are not sanctified primarily for their own good, but for the building up of the Church according to the teaching of St. Peter, "as living stones into a spiritual house" (I Pet. 2, 5). The indefectibility of the Church in her sanctifying powers is impossible without the indelibility of the sacramental characters.

The Character and Grace

Having made a clear distinction between the functions of grace and of the character, we must add: (1) that every valid but sacrilegious use of the character is to our own prejudice and condemnation; (2) that the "constant" of the character will be affected by the amount of sanctifying grace already possessed; (3) that as an exigent title to grace and glory, the character, if deprived of divine grace by mortal sin, tends

to regain it; (4) that this indelible character can really exist in heresy, schism, apostasy, and dissident churches, and that the valid but illicit use of it will be a source of sanctification for our separated brethren of good faith; (5) that validly baptized infants in dissident churches cannot be considered dissidents before the age of reason.

There are, then, five possible states in regard to grace and the character: neither grace nor the character; grace, but no character; the character, but no grace; the character and grace in a dissident of good faith; the character and grace in the unity of the Church. Only the last fully responds to the exigencies of Christ and His Mystical Body.

II. The Eucharistic Body and the Sacramental Character

In his last pastoral letter of 1949, Cardinal Suhard wrote: "The character is not any undefined participation in the Priesthood of Christ, but is a participation in that priesthood in so far as it is expressed by the cult of the New Law." And we know that all the worship of the New Law, adoration, contrition, thanksgiving, and supplication, find their fullest perfection in the Mass.

"Strictly speaking," wrote Fr. A. Lemonnyer, O.P., "the liturgical cult is the joint result of the virtue of religion and the triple sacramental character . . . The sacred liturgy which we celebrate . . . gets its nature as a true, Christian, legitimate and efficacious cult from the sacramental character." In other words, the sacramental character is that precise power which fits us for the Eucharistic liturgy. Without the character, the Eucharist could not exist; that the Eucharist exists is owing to the character. Or, to put it another way, the character is the prerequisite for the Eucharist, which is the vital and central act of the Church. Does not St. Thomas (*S.T.*, III, 63, 2) call the character a spiritual potency completely ordered to the cult of the Blessed Trinity? Why is it that the Eucharist, through which the Church performs its worship, should be the touchstone of the respective powers of the baptized, the confirmed laypeople, the priests, and the bishops?

Relation of the Baptismal Character to the Eucharist

In the primitive Church the neophytes completed their initiation into the Church by the reception of the Holy Eucharist on Easter night. There was also a practice, which still exists in the Eastern Church, of giving Communion to the newly-baptized infant. Even in our own day, the Church prescribes (*C.I.C.* 854, 2) that we give Viaticum to baptized children who have not yet made their First Communion if they are able to distinguish the Eucharist from ordinary bread.

These practices should make us see that the Baptismal character is a "receptive capacity" for the Eucharist, and that, as such, it should be activated. Just as any potency tends to atrophy if it is not used, so the baptismal character will "atrophy" if it is not brought into frequent contact with its proper object, the Eucharist. That is why *Mediator Dei* urges us to arouse the baptized from their apathy and to encourage them to take advantage of the riches of the baptismal character. "It is therefore desirable, Venerable Brethren, that all the faithful should be aware that to participate in the Eucharistic Sacrifice is their chief duty and supreme dignity, and that not in an inert and negligent fashion, giving way to distractions and day-dreaming, but with such earnestness and

concentration that they may be united as closely as possible with the High Priest."

The Confirmation Character and the Eucharist

What is true of the baptismal character is even more true of the character of confirmation. The latter, as its name indicates, strengthens the baptismal character as a participation in the Priesthood of Christ. The confirmed will participate in Christ's Priesthood no longer as a child but as a vigorous, fully conscious defender of the Church.

Since confirmation increases the capacity for participation in the Eucharist, the confirmed Catholic should be more actively associated with the Sacrifice of the Mass. Or, as Fr. B. Durst, O.S.B., puts it: "Just as the baptismal character gives one the power to receive the sacraments validly, so confirmation gives the power of receiving them with greater benefit; and in a somewhat similar fashion the two characters prepare one for the Sacrifice of the Mass."

The Character of Holy Orders in Relation to the Eucharist

Although the faculties conferred by the characters of baptism and confirmation are active in their own right, they depend essentially on the character of holy orders in priests and bishops. Only bishops can communicate the sacerdotal life and become fathers of priests. Without this communication priests cannot consecrate, cannot change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. With the priestly life and character, the priest becomes a conjoint instrument of Christ the Priest, able now to offer sacrifice to the glory of God and the salvation of mankind.

And although the Sacrifice of the Mass always makes the offerer pleasing to God and unites him more closely to God, we priests should remember that it benefits us in proportion to the degree of charity which we possess, and that, conversely, our lack of the virtue of religion diminishes the benefits of the Mass for ourselves, for the Church, and for the whole world. *Quantum potes, tantum aude!* The members of the Mystical Body can never offer the Mass with as much fervor as their sacramental character demands.

All the great movements of Christian thought, Augustinianism in the fifth, Thomism in the thirteenth, and the French School in the seventeenth century, have studied the dogmatic and moral importance of the indelible character. Is it not right, therefore, that our twentieth century should not permit this doctrine, so fundamental and synthetic, to remain any longer the least-known of all the teachings of the Church?

RELATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

As an aid to those who may wish to do further reading about the Sacraments and the "priesthood of the faithful" a list of related works is given here and on p. 52. These two bibliographies are intended to supplement each other. Obviously, no attempt is made to present an exhaustive list of pertinent readings. Standard sources, such as textbooks or encyclopedias, are not included; nor is mention made of the large number of commentaries on the two encyclicals *Mystici Corporis* and *Mediator Dei* which touch on this subject.

B. d'Argenlieu, "Note sur deux définitions médiévales du caractère sacramentel," *Revue Thomiste*, 33 (1928), pp. 271 ff.; "La doctrine d'Albert le Grand

sur le caractère sacramentel," *ibid.*, 33 (1928), pp. 295 ff., 479 ff.; "La doctrine de S. Thomas sur le caractère sacramentel," *ibid.*, 34 (1929), pp. 219 ff., 289 ff.

L. Audet, "Notre participation au sacerdoce du Christ," *Laval Théologique et Philosophique,* 1(1945), pp. 9-46, 110-130.

E. Boularand, S.J., "Caractère sacramentel et mystère du Christ," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* 72(1950), pp. 252-274.

J. Brinktrine, "Das Amtspriestertum und das allgemeine Priestertum der Gläubigen," *Divus Thomas* (Freiburg), 22 (1944), pp. 291-308.

M. de la Taille, S.J., "La doctrine catholique de l'Eucharistie," in *Eucharistia* (edit. by M. Brillant), Paris, 1934, pp. 151-203.

F. Dölger, *Sphragis, eine altchristliche Taufbezeichnung* . . ., Paderborn, 1911.

E. Doronzo, O.M.I.—has a series of articles which appeared in the *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*: 4(1934), pp. 213-228*; 5(1935), pp. 238-260*; 6(1936), pp. 243-262*; 7(1937), pp. 181-194*; 10(1940), pp. 24-44*. The treatment of the sacramental character in his *De Sacramentis in Genere* (Milwaukee, Bruce, 1946), pp. 264-338, should be mentioned because of its completeness.

B. Durst, O.S.B., "De Characteribus Sacramentalibus," *Xenia Thomistica,* vol. 2, Rome, 1925, pp. 541-581.

P. Evdokimoff, "Sacerdoce royal: une vue orthodoxe sur la place du laicat dans l'Eglise," *Revue Nouvelle,* 15(1952), pp. 78-85.

A. Ferland, P.S.S., *Le Sacerdoce Laique, Fondement de l'Action Catholique,* Montreal, 1936.

R. Fournier, S.S., *La Théologie de l'Action Catholique,* Montreal, 1940.

N. Gihr, *Les sacrements de l'Eglise catholique* (translated from the German by Abbé Mazoyer), Paris, 1901.

C. Heris, O.P., *The Mystery of Christ* (translated by D. Fahey, C.S.Sp.), Westminster (Maryland), Newman, 1950.

T. Hesburgh, C.S.C., *The Relation of the Sacramental Characters of Baptism and Confirmation to the Lay Apostolate,* Washington, 1946.

C. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné,* Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, vol. 1, 1941, vol. 2, 1951. There are two more volumes to follow.

W. Kavanagh, *Lay Participation in Christ's Priesthood,* Washington, 1935.

O. Laake, *Ueber den sakramentalen Charakter,* Munich, 1903.

S. McCormack, O.P., "The Configuration of the Sacramental Character," *Thomist,* 7(1944), pp. 458-491.

E. Mersch, *The Theology of the Mystical Body* (translated by C. Vollert, S.J.), chaps. 16-19, St. Louis, Herder, 1951.

E. Neveut, C.M., "La grace sacramentelle," *Divus Thomas* (Piacenza), 38 (1935), pp. 249-285.

P. Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments,* chap. 4, St. Louis, Herder, 1910.

Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales (Abbaye du Mont César, Louvain), 31(1950), Bulletin, nos. 112-141; 33(1952), Bulletin, nos. 567-570, 587-596.

M. Scheeben, *Mysteries of Christianity* (translated by C. Vollert, S.J.), chap. 20, St. Louis, Herder, 1946.

The Name of Jesus *in the* New Testament

Ceslaus Spicq, O.P.

Although the Holy Name of Jesus was not celebrated as a feast of the Universal Church until the year 1721, devotion to the Holy Name is as old as the Church. This article, "Le Nom de Jésus dans le Nouveau Testament," La Vie Spirituelle, *36(1952), pp. 5-18, examines the richness of the New Testament revelation regarding the Holy Name. The entire issue in which the article appeared was devoted to a study of the Holy Name.*

The Messias had been acclaimed by the prophets by many titles appropriate to the functions He was to perform: *Emmanuel,* "God with us;" *Prince of Peace, Branch.* But His proper name, expressing fully His vocation and the gift of God He was to transmit, was wrapped as yet in secrecy: "And thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name" (Isa. 62:2). This name chosen by God Himself is announced by an angel to Mary and Joseph alike. "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and shalt bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus" (Luke 1:31). "She shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21-25).

The Name Given by God

A name is well chosen if it corresponds in some way to the qualities or to the nature of that to which it is applied. The proper names chosen by men, however, refer as a rule only to some exterior characteristics or accidental circumstance of life—to a circumstance of time, or of kinship, or of some physical characteristic. But when God condescends to name a creature, He chooses a name which will call to mind the destiny of the bearer. Thus it is that God changed the name of Abram to Abraham, "Father of many nations," and of Simon, son of John, to Peter-Cephas.

Now God destined the son of Mary to save the entire world. Whatever are to be His other activities, all are to converge on this one work of salvation. This is precisely what the Hebrew name Josue, Jesus, signifies. Moreover, since the Christ cannot accomplish this work of reconciliation except in virtue of His condition of Man-God, it follows that the name, Jesus, designates most aptly not only the salvific role of the Savior but also His very being as the Son of God incarnate. Every act of Jesus will be a redemptive act by reason of the Person of the Son of God who places it and by reason of the human nature of the man who accomplishes it. The Holy Name of Jesus is the most all-embracing expression of the totality of being of Christ, and of His role on earth and in heaven. And since to name a person, according to the Semitic conception of things, is to enter into intimacy with him and in some way to have a claim upon him, a believer cannot name or invoke Jesus without placing himself within the radiancy of His saving grace and receiving of His gifts.

A Name of Mercy

It was by this name of Jesus that

the Savior was known among men. It was Jesus who submitted to the same infirmities as the rest of men, who was tempted, who knew the pangs of hunger, who wept, who was buffeted, who expired with a cry, and who was laid in a tomb. All this was of one piece with His mission as Savior, for by sharing the same trials which weigh upon His brothers in humanity He feels for them a compassion indispensable to His office. The name of Jesus denotes compassion.

A Name of Faith

To His contemporaries and intimates Jesus was also "a man approved by God" (Acts 2:22), and the faith of the early Church consisted in attributing to this man Jesus the attributes of Savior and of God. Thus the Gospel of St. John was written "that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name," which means Savior (John 20:31). Faith consists precisely in the copula: Jesus *is* the Christ, Jesus *is* the Savior, Jesus *is* God.

In effect, the disciples believed that Jesus is risen from the dead, that He is not a man as the rest of men, but that He is the Messias announced by the prophets, the Christ; nay more, that He is the Word made Flesh and worthy of adoration. Thus the name of Jesus, imposed by God as the proper name of one new-born, is to be pronounced, spelled out, by each believer, who will discover in it progressively all its riches of doctrine and of power. Simultaneously, the mystery of salvation will develop and reveal itself to the believer. This mystery comprises not merely the pardon of sins but the possibility of being reborn into a new life which is properly divine. "Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (I John 5:1).

The whole preaching of the Apostles and the apologetic of the primitive Church is comprised in this demonstration: to prove that Jesus is the Christ (Acts 3:13; 4:27; Rom. 8:11). Herein is the very heart of Christianity, wholly centered upon Jesus and upon adherence by faith: "If thou confess with thy mouth that Jesus is the Lord, and believe in thy heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom. 10:9). Two elements are distinguished in this creed: faith in the Incarnation of Jesus, Lord-God from His entry into the world, and faith in His Resurrection, the sign of the approbation of God upon all His work.

No man can, of himself, possess such a faith nor promise such a persevering fidelity in the midst of an evil world. "No one can say 'Jesus is Lord,' except in the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 12:3). The profession of faith supposes and attests the action of the Spirit of God and is, in its object or its causes, remarkably Trinitarian. If the Father, in brief, has designated His incarnate Son by a name pronounceable by men, the Holy Spirit, in His turn, has glorified the name of Jesus (John 16:14). The light of the Holy Spirit and the true faith are so intimately bound together that the infallible criterion by which to judge if an inspiration is of God is the conviction which one has about Jesus (I John 4:2-3). If one professes the Incarnation, he is moved by the Holy Spirit; but if he thinks that Jesus and the Christ are two distinct persons, if he "divides, dismembers" Jesus, then he bears himself as Anti-Christ and the agent of Satan.

The fundamental dogma of the Church is not so much that of the divinity of Jesus, but of the union in Him of the divinity and the humanity, since it is by this title that Jesus is the Savior. More exactly, there is question less of ideas

and of abstract truths than of a Person, that of the Son Incarnate, who reunites in Himself heaven and earth (Eph. 1:10), who expresses the love of God for men, and who realizes the redemption of sinners. To misconstrue Jesus, whether in His very being or in His vocation, is to reduce to nothing the economy of providence. It is remarkable indeed that from the very beginning the Apostles had a keen perception of this relation: "This is the stone that was rejected by you, the builders, which has become the corner stone. Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:11-12).

In all these texts, faith in the divine Sonship of Jesus, which establishes a reciprocal communion between the Christian and God, is not a simple assent of the mind. It must express itself in a public profession of faith, that is to say, in a commitment of the whole man. To believe in Jesus or to confess His name is to belong to Him body and soul, to love Him, and to serve Him. Here is the abyss which separates believers from unbelievers. Mankind is divided into two camps over the pronunciation of one sole name. For the one group this name has no meaning; for the other, it has the power of a flame, it is the secret of their lives: "Who is there that overcomes the world if not he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God?" (I John 5:5). The Son of God, incarnate and risen from the dead, has brought back a decisive victory over Satan, over sin, and over death; His followers, thanks to the vital bond of faith, have at their command this same unconquerable force, and report the same victories over the same enemies. The triumph of the Head diffuses itself into the members (I Cor. 15:57).

A Name of Hope

It follows, then, that the name of Jesus is not only the object of a justifying and sanctifying faith, but also a source of Christian hope. The high object of our hope is the resurrection of the body. "He who raised up Jesus will raise up us also with Jesus" (II Cor. 4:14). By a living faith the Christian is grafted as a member into the body of Christ. But since the Head of this body is risen, it follows necessarily that the whole body shall likewise rise.

This similarity of destiny is undeniable since it is but the achievement of that identification with Jesus which is realized progressively with the progress of Christian life. The Savior infuses His own life into each Christian, that is to say, He continues to die and to live in him, reproducing in his soul His own proper traits, assimilating him to Himself. This metamorphosis finds a climax in such a likeness that one could almost say that the name of Jesus belongs to each Christian (Luke 6:22; Acts 22:8; 26:15); so it seemed, certainly, to the Apostle who was called to prolong the mystery of salvation in souls and who bore about in his flesh "the marks of the Lord Jesus" (Gal. 6:17). It is on the cross above all that Jesus justified His name of Savior; it is by sharing in this sacrifice that the Apostles propagated the Faith, converted souls, gave life to the world *per Jesum!*

A Name Charged With Power

Among Semites the name is as it were a substitute for the person. Jesus demanded of His disciples that they leave all "for my name's sake" (Matt. 19:29), or that they receive a child "in my name" (Matt. 18:20). When the Apostles preach "in the name of Jesus" (Acts 4:18; 5:40; 9:27), they mean to teach with all the personal authority of the Master. Ordinarily, we do not emphasize

enough the fact that, for a Semite, the name is also charged with efficacy. It contains a virtue, a power to accomplish. To invoke it is to make it act, to put its potential to work. It is above all in prayer, therefore, that the Holy Name of Jesus should be upon the lips of Christions. "If you ask the Father anything in my name, he will give it to you" (John 16:23).

The name of Jesus is actually more powerful now than it was before the Resurrection. It was better for men, therefore, that Jesus should leave them and return in glory to the right hand of the Father (John 16:7). There, face to face with His Father, He continues His role of Savior in unceasing intercession. It is thus that the Epistle to the Hebrews envisages Him, the Epistle which is wont to designate the heavenly High Priest by His name, Jesus, the better to signify that, after His Ascension, He is more a Savior than ever before. What an example He is for those who have yet to strive here below. The Head, who by His trials has attained the end, will grant those who follow Him the same beatitude by way of the same tribulations. A Savior—**that** He was yesterday upon the cross, that He remains more than ever today in heaven, that He will be unceasingly forever (Heb. 13:8).

A Name Above Every Name

What are we to say of the majesty of Jesus in heaven and of the grandeur of His name? The Epistle to the Hebrews places that name incomparably above that of all the angels (Heb. 1:4; cf. Eph. 1:20-21); the Apocalypse portrays Him as a rider mounted upon a white horse, "and he has on his garment and on his thigh a name written, 'King of kings and Lord of lords'" (Apoc. 19:16). This designation is that of the supreme monarch, a divine predicate.

Truly, the real name of Jesus in heaven, expressing fully all that He is, is ineffable (Apoc. 19:12). Yet may we meditate on the text in Philippians, that crowning revelation of the name of Jesus in the New Testament: "He humbled himself, becoming obedient to death, even to death on a cross. Therefore God also has exalted him and has bestowed upon him the name that is above every name, so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bend of those in heaven, on earth and under the earth, and every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:8-11). Jesus is no longer only the name of faith and of hope; it is the name of adoration. The name above every name or the title of Savior is the one which the Old Testament reserved to Yahweh alone. Jesus the man, who had taken the position of a slave, has regained His splendor as God. Willingly or unwillingly all shall confess Him. It is the name of Jesus that is acclaimed in this apotheosis, and this acclamation is the height of worship in spirit and in truth which the believing soul is able to attain. The wonder is that the humanity of Jesus will henceforth be associated with His transcendence, so that we can always call by the name Jesus the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity.

A name expressive of faith and of hope, the Holy Name of Jesus is also a name expressive of the most fervent love. Jesus is the gift and the revelation of the love of the Father for men. It is in calling on the name of Jesus that the children of God express their love and gratitude. Their ardent desire is ultimately to be united forever to their Savior, to see Him, to live with Him. The very last word of revelation is the cry of enthusiasm of the loving soul, calling upon the one object of its desire: "Come, Lord Jesus" (Apoc. 22:20).

THEOLOGY LOOKS EAST

Russia's great imperialistic expansion, the political and social awakening of the peoples of Asia, and the explosive situation in Asia Minor, have turned the thoughts of Europe and America to the East. Many theologians, especially those who are pioneering in the field of missiology, have undertaken a careful study of the religious ideas of Russia and the Orient, and a considerable portion of current theological writing is concerned with this subject. Three great currents of non-Occidental thought (Russian, Indian, and Chinese) are discussed in the articles which are abstracted here.

Bernhard Schultze, S.J., "Die Sozialprinzipien in der russischen Religionsphilosophie," ***Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,*** **73(1951), pp. 385-423.**

Leaving aside the whole body of communist thought, the author sets himself the task of finding the place of five cardinal social principles (unity, love, justice, solidarity, and subsidiarity) in Russian religious philosophy. In his introductory remarks he points out that strictly one should not speak of a Russian philosophy of religion; it would be more correct to call it a "theology of revelation."

Examination of the religious thought of the great Russian minds of the past century and a half (men like Dostoievsky, Soloviev, and Berdyaev) reveals that the five social principles in question have a very definite place. Actually, they are contained in those key ideas which dominate Russian religious thought and give it a distinctly social character.

The Russian outlook is characterized by a deep sense of community, of the brotherhood of men. This is expressed in the untranslatable word "sobornost" which, though it means "catholic" and always retains a religious overtone, is not restricted to association in the Church. Instead it signifies the whole family as united in love and freedom.

This notion of community is carried still further in the concept of "all-embracing unity." Here it is a question of the close interrelationship of God and His universe, of man to God and to everything in the universe. This idea is intimately connected with those of "God-manhood" and "Sophia."

"God-manhood" expresses the communion between God and men. "Sophia" (Wisdom) points to the fact that creation reflects its divine Exemplar and in its own beauty and completeness mirrors the beauty and fullness of eternal creative Wisdom.

Governed by these ideas, Russian thought tends to consider humanity as an organism, and Russian thinkers are much attracted to a comprehensive historical-religious-cultural history of mankind. Yet, great stress is placed on personal liberty, and unity is to be obtained by the bond of love and brotherhood, not by any "Roman legalism."

There is a deep awareness of the deficiencies in the social structure, but these defects and their solutions are viewed from the aspect of religion. The ultimate ground for the unity of men and of creation is seen to be the triune God, and the present divisions among men are attributed to sin. Christ's redemption will prove the solution, for it will finally overcome sin and raise mankind to its fullness and perfect reflection of the Trinity.

P. Johanns, S.J., "Théologie catholique et sagesse des Indes," ***Doctor Communis,*** **4(1951), pp. 160-179.**

Can the natural wisdom of India be used as an element in the building of an Indian Catholic theology, as Greek philosophy was employed in the development of Latin and Byzantine theology? Yes, answers Father Johanns in this article, because Indian thought is basically much more religious than was that of Greece.

St. Thomas in his great synthesis of natural and supernatural wisdom utilized insights from different streams of Greek thought to correct one another, and fulfilled the unrealized potentialities of Greek philosophy by sublimating it in the truth of Christian revelation. So, too, the different systems of Indian thought complement one another and one can be used to correct the defects of another; and the truest and most sublime

facets of Indian wisdom will attain their fullness when subordinated to the wisdom of Christ.

There are many points of affinity between Indian and Christian thought which condition Indian minds for receiving the truth of Christ and which show the possibilities of constructing an Indian theology. Spirit and spiritual values are of paramount importance; concupiscence is recognized as the root of much of the disorder in human life; there is remarkable insight into the place of intellectual pride in sin; abnegation is stressed as a means of freeing the spirit from inertia and inordinate passion.

It is true that pantheism holds a predominant place in Indian thinking, that there is no concept of true creation. Yet, in the teaching of the great philosopher Cankara concerning the transcendent spirituality and simplicity of God, we can find the basis for eliminating pantheism and a cornerstone for the construction of Indian theology.

Cankara pushes God's transcendence to the point of making God indeterminate and impersonal, but this excess can be corrected and an even loftier notion of transcendence obtained by introducing the true notion of analogy into Indian thought. Besides, Indian philosophy itself contains a counterbalance to the impersonality of Cankara's God: The Bhaktas, who teach an unselfish devoted abandonment of oneself to the sovereignty of God, also teach that God is joined in love to men, as a father to his children. This Bhakti doctrine, purely natural and warped by pantheism, would receive its true meaning and sublimity in the Christian doctrines of creation and the fatherhood of God. Yet, even in its incompleteness it expresses the noble aspirations of the Indian heart, and it shows the possibilities and the need of winning the mind of India by developing a truly Indian and Catholic theology.

Stanislaus Lokuang, "La spiritualité des Chinois," *Eglise Vivante*, 3(1951), pp. 25-35.

Chinese life has been animated and directed by Confucianism which is not a religion but a natural "spirituality." In this article Monsignor Lokuang points out the chief characteristics of this outlook on life.

Confucius classified men as "honorable" or "selfish." The "selfish man" (who is despised) seeks his own utility, material possessions, and profit. The "honorable man" (the ideal of every good Chinese) lives according to virtue and law, and seeks to fulfill his proper function in society and perform the duties of his state in life. In brief, he observes the *Li* which embraces all juridical and moral law, ceremonial, and social usage. This deep and abiding sense of duty can be singled out as the first characteristic of Chinese "spirituality."

God's perfection is reflected in the order of nature and in man's conscience, which guides human life in accordance with this order. The *Li*, which provides man with a rule of life that enables him to live according to his conscience, is not the result of human legislation; it is taught by sages who have contemplated God's reflection in the ordered universe. Chinese morality is pervaded by the idea of God; this is the second mark of their "spirituality." Parents are reverenced because they are God's representatives; the emperor is obeyed and honored because his authority is from God.

God's productive influence in the world manifests His universal love. Men must imitate this love. Although a special affection should be reserved for one's own family, all men must be loved as brothers and helped on the way to perfection. This universal love is the third characteristic of the Chinese outlook.

Perhaps the most important principle is that of the "golden mean." The world of nature teaches us that moderation and due proportion cause peace, excess and violence bring disorder. The virtuous and moderate man will be slow to change traditional ways; that is why the traditions of the people arise again unchanged after violent tyranny or reform.

By conforming themselves to the orderliness of the universe, the Chinese people share in the placid tranquility and stability of nature. Chinese "spirituality" can be summed up in one principle: live in harmony with the entire universe.

Problems of
PARTICIPATION IN THE MASS

Clifford Howell, S.J.

In the 1950-51 volume of Orate Fratres, *and continuing into the 1951-52 volume of* Worship *(the magazine's new name), Fr. Clifford Howell, S.J., wrote a series of twelve articles as an introduction to the whole field of liturgy. He sought to explain in clear, non-technical language the theological background of liturgy. It was as he said "a series of articles of an elementary type for the precise purpose of helping new readers to find their bearings." The articles were not only valuable for beginners, but proved to be excellent helps for those who sought to explain liturgy to students, parishioners, and others. One of the last articles in the series, "Problems of Participation,"* Worship, *26(1952), pp. 161-173, has been chosen for digesting because of the light it sheds on the objectives of the liturgical movement.*

The present article is intended to discuss this question: Is it right that the Sacrifice of the Christian people as a whole should be enacted in a manner which is fitted only to a few? Should not genuine active participation be within the powers of all? Yet the fact is that the great majority of our Catholic people cannot participate actively in the liturgy of the Mass as we now have it. And the solution does not lie in mere instruction, for the amount of instruction that would be needed is greater than is feasible.

The problem of active participation, old as it is, was not even properly diagnosed until Blessed Pius X pointed out that "the primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit is active participation in the solemn and public worship of the Church." The problem is: people are cut off from this indispensable source of true Christian spirit because they cannot actively participate in the worship of the Church. And the heart of this problem is in the disparity between what the Mass really is and how the Mass is celebrated.

According to its intrinsic essence the Mass is community worship. But the external form of the Church's public worship suits only a cultured few; the rest are condemned to a state of passive and detached spectatorship. The present Mass liturgy is practically useless as the vehicle of community worship.

Let us study the problem more closely. The principal act of Catholic worship is the Mass. The Mass is by its nature, which no externals can alter, the sacrifice of the Church. For as the Pope says in *Mediator Dei,* "Every time the priest re-enacts what the divine Redeemer did at the Last Supper, the sacrifice is really accomplished; and this sacrifice, always and everywhere, necessarily and of its very nature, has a public and social character. . . . This is so whether the faithful are present . . . or whether they are absent."

Now it should be obvious that the social and public character of the sacrifice though it can never cease to exist, is capable of varying degrees of manifestation. And though it does not make any difference to the Mass iself, it does make an enormous difference to the faithful whether the public and social character of the Mass is expressed or not.

Moreover, if the externals of the Mass—that is to say, its liturgical

form—does express the internal reality of its social nature, then the form fits the content. It is something genuine, vital, "in order."

The problem of public worship has arisen precisely because the Mass-liturgy, which was designed to express the public and social nature of the sacrifice (and once actually did so), does so no longer. It obscures from the people the underlying reality of the Mass and renders their active participation in it so difficult that normally they take no part in the liturgy at all.

To see how vital the liturgy once was, and contrast it with things as they are now, let us reflect a little on the history of the Mass-liturgy.

What Our Lord did at the Last Supper was simply this: He took bread and wine which His Apostles had placed before Him; He turned these into His body as given and His blood as shed; and He distributed the results among the Apostles. So He instituted that which was, by its nature, a sacrifice; and by its form, a communal meal. And He told the Apostles to do the same in memory of Him.

Now this simple action of His became surrounded in time by a ritual; a ritual which was intended not merely to invest the proceedings with solemnity, but also to expand, to explain, to manifest ever more clearly all that was involved in these actions of Our Lord. And this to the needs of his own flock. For became enshrined is what we call the liturgy of the Mass.

This liturgy attained particular excellence under Pope St. Gregory about the end of the sixth century. He produced a ritual of actions and words which was admirably suited to the needs of his own flock. For them it was a living liturgy—easy, natural, intelligible—in the course of which they, as the Roman Christian community, prayed together, were instructed together, offered sacrifices together, and received of its fruits together. Its external form perfectly expressed its underlying reality.

This liturgy was shaped by Pope St. Gregory according to two principles which had been at work in all the Mass-forms of all the local churches from the earliest times. The first of these principles was the use of the people's own language. The second principle was that the various things to be done by the community at worship should be apportioned among various people; all were to do their own parts, fulfilling their own functions, not arrogating to themselves the functions of others.

According to these two principles, and making use of prayer-forms customary even before his time, Pope St. Gregory put together the most perfect Mass-liturgy that has ever existed. It is worth our while to review its main features.

To begin with, the Christian community were to have communal prayers, instruction and song. Hence:

1. *The Entrance Rite.* The sacred ministers entered, accompanied by the song of the people led by the schola (group of trained singers). The celebrant, having entered, greeted the people and prayed in their name (Introit and Collect).

2. *The Instruction.* There were Scripture readings, variable in number and interspersed with psalm-singing. These readings were given by different officials, *not* the celebrant. The last was the deacon, who sang the Gospel. After these readings the celebrant gave the homily (Epistle, Gospel, sermon).

Now the community proceeded to offer sacrifice.

1. There was the offertory procession, in which the people brought their gifts to the altar, singing a psalm as they came. The celebrant chanted, aloud, and in the vernacular, a prayer over the gifts (Offertory, Secret).

2. Next came the Eucharistic Prayer in the course of which the people's gifts were transformed into the Victim of Calvary, and offered in sacrifice to God. This, of course, was the celebrant's own special part; but the people had some share in it at the beginning (Preface responses), in the middle (*Sanctus* chant) and at the end (the "Great Amen"); and they had the function of being witnesses throughout since it was all chanted aloud in their own tongue so that they heard and understood every word of it.

3. The community, having given their gift to God, now approached to receive God's return-gift, by partaking of the Sacrificial Victim from the altar. This Communion procession was preceded by the singing of the Lord's Prayer and the Breaking of Bread, accompanied by the people's own psalm-singing, and followed by the final prayer of the celebrant and dismissal by the deacon (*Pater Noster, Pax,* Communion, Postcommunion, *Ite*).

In this wonderfully simple and crystal-clear Roman Mass-liturgy there are several points worthy of our special attention, because it is precisely the lack of these which make our modern Mass-liturgy so dead.

a. There were no private prayers of any kind; every work of the whole ceremony was audible to the people; every word, being in their own tongue, was intelligible to them.

b. Every part was actually done by those to whom it was assigned; nobody did anybody else's part.

c. The intrinsic purpose of each phase of this Mass-drama was not only obvious, but was actually achieved.

The present Mass-liturgy offers a depressing contrast. Now the people do not so much as hear many of the prayers, and those that they do hear they do not understand. Now the priest does everything, and the result looks like a "one-man sacrifice"; and this, after all, is precisely what it is *not.*

This liturgy of St. Gregory's was very obviously social; it was something of great interest, intelligible from beginning to end, moving, inspiring, and at certain points even spectacular. And it was all entirely practicable, within the capabilities of the common people. They did not have to learn any dead language; they did not have to be taught how to use missals; they did not even have to be able to read. Only the sacred ministers and the schola had to be formally educated. The common people were able to take their full part in the liturgy equipped with only those powers which pertained to them as human beings, namely, the power to see, to hear, to walk, to sing.

But alas, this wonderful, living, fascinating Mass-liturgy did not survive St. Gregory's time by much more than a century. The lay people were gradually reduced to the role of "silent and detached spectators." We can only sketch hastily the story of this decline.

Missionaries went forth from Rome, taking Gregory's Mass-books with them. Some of them, like SS. Cyril and Methodius, observed the Roman principle that the language of worship should be the language of the people, and so they fashioned a liturgy in the tongue of their converts. But few were so wise and far-seeing. Though they

preached in the vernacular, when it came to worship they stuck to the familiar Latin.

Since the liturgy was in the strange Latin tongue, the people could no longer do the singing, which was more and more taken over by a specially-trained choir. And as these choirs became more specialized, their music became more complicated and long. Thus, to keep from waiting for long intervals, the priest began to say more and more of his prayers privately while the choir was singing something else. And really, it made no difference any longer whether or not the people heard the priest, for they could not understand the Latin, which, even at Rome, had ceased to be the language of the people.

Hence the people no longer loved the Mass, for they could neither understand it nor take part in it. They came with diminished frequency; and they rarely communicated, especially since the offertory procession had dropped out through the use of unleavened bread, and distasteful money-collections were introduced instead. The liturgy, like its language, became a dead thing among the people.

Thus gradually, over the course of centuries, the living, organically active, and united worship of clergy and people degenerated into a formal ritualism, the almost exclusive preserve of clerics and religious. All that the people could do was to watch. And if the active participation of the people was thus killed by these gradual changes in the sung Mass, we may say that it was buried and covered with a tomb-stone by the developments in low Mass which had become much more common. It was here that the principle of "differentiation of function" died too. There being no deacon, no sub-deacon, and no choir, the priest took over the functions of them all.

In the sixteenth century all these retrograde changes were incorporated into rubrics which have perpetuated them even unto our own day. In the chaos of those evil days of the Reformation it was, of course, absolutely necessary that the Mass be rigidly stabilized by the imposition of hard-and-fast rubrics. One shudders to think what might have happened to the Mass later on if it had not been, as it were, frozen into a rigid form. Just think of what happened to church music and vestments.

But one feels that it ought to be recognized now, after four centuries, that the "rigor mortis" is at least beginning to pass off. A reform of rubrics in the light of subsequent liturgical research is urgently needed. For, as they are, the rubrics constitute one of the major problems of the practical liturgist who is working to restore active participation of the people. They tend to keep the Mass such that the people cannot participate.

Until there is a reform of the rubrics we can only resort to partial expedients which are liturgically unsatisfactory, such as making somebody read the Epistle and the Gospel in English *while* the priest reads them in Latin. These expedients are not "the real thing"; they are not integrated into the liturgy itself. It is not one thing that is going on, but two.

However, there is hope. The new Holy Saturday rubrics, for instance, do give us "the real thing" in the congregational candle-lighting and in the vernacular renewal of the baptismal vows. We need many more such reforms. In time, please God, we shall have them.

The Internal Development of Protestantism

E. W. Zeeden

Since the first World War there has been a most important reassessment of religious values on the part of many European Protestants, and a trend away from liberalism and rationalism. The historical roots of this movement as well as its present position are explained in this article by Professor E. W. Zeeden, "Ueber die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte des Protestantismus seit der Reformation," Theologie und Glaube, *41(1951), pp. 218-242.*

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was intended to be a renovation of the Church, an intention that gained powerful support in the Christian West. At the root of the reform movement was the theology created from Sacred Scripture which Martin Luther and the other prominent reformers first worked out for themselves personally and then spread throughout Germany and the northern countries. The result of their theological teaching was the dethroning of the Church in favor of the Bible.

Two fundamental ideas governed this break with the Church: a new, subjective criterion for judging the validity of Christian religion, the principle of freedom of conscience; and secondly, the doctrine of justification by faith alone. These two basic elements in the initial position of Protestantism provided the foundation for a development of Protestantism in either of two different directions.

Orthodox Lutheranism

The Lutheran theologians and faithful were convinced that Martin Luther had been given as a redeeming angel and prophet of almost superhuman stature. This conviction gave them the preliminary condition for the establishment of Lutheran orthodoxy. They believed that within the framework of this orthodox Lutheranism they could correctly and reliably decide between truth and error.

Every teaching, interpretation, or ecclesiastical organization which could not be justified from Luther's principles was rejected and more or less ceremoniously condemned. Emphasis on conscience and on private interpretation of Scripture led to individualism, to the splintering off of different church groups, and to diversity in doctrine—and so, to prevent such results, the very possibility of a conscientious protest against the ruling church and its teaching was denied in practice and in theory. As a result, evangelical orthodoxy came to be characterized interiorly by a monumental uniformity and intolerance in theological doctrine, and exteriorly by the phalanx of leaders of the regional churches. Those who still adhered to an individualistic spirituality were forced to live as an underground movement under cover of orthodoxy.

Rise of Neo-Protestantism

Around the end of the seventeenth century a new movement

began to stir the Protestant spirit. Its tendencies can be characterized in a few phrases: a feeling of tolerance; the inclination to consider the church as invisible; transfer of the field of true piety from the social sphere of the church to the interior of the individual soul; isolation of the knowledge of reason from that of faith; the questioning of authority as such; and a thorough-going individualism.

After 1700 the Neo-Protestants began to cut out essential parts of Protestantism which orthodox Lutherans had believed were never to be renounced. The decline of the orthodox system was made possible through the principle of freedom of conscience which Luther himself had planted in Protestantism. Freedom of conscience became so important that in case of doubt it was to supplant both church and dogma.

Two currents of thought, Pietism and the Enlightenment, led the attack on evangelical Protestantism in the early eighteenth century. Pietism prized inner piety, and considered this to be of the highest value and independent of membership in any definite confession, even in evangelical Lutheranism. This Pietist emphasis on freedom of conscience was extended by thinkers of the Enlightenment to freedom of thought. Since freedom of conscience gave the Enlightenment permission to make up its own mind on religion and church, religion and church became fair game for personal interpretation and criticism. Man no longer submitted himself to religion, but submitted religion to his own judgment and reasoning; he had made himself religiously and spiritually autonomous.

Heritage of the Enlightenment

As a consequence of this secularization of religious values, Protestantism and the modern world met. If freedom of conscience is understood as freedom from absolute, objective spiritual authority, then the Protestant was the modern, autonomous man. In so far as it rejected the binding force of revealed faith, Protestantism did not form the modern world and society, but was transformed by the modern world.

In the place of Christian longing for salvation there entered earthly longing for good fortune and striving for progress. This reversal extended to all the objects of theology. Interest shifted from the heavenly Jerusalem to the earthly state, from the Christian religion to natural religion, from spiritual brotherhood in Christ to political and social brotherhood in the state and humanity.

But the most significant reversal of values is the claim of the Protestant theologians of the Enlightenment that they are good Lutherans and stand on the foundation of the Reformation. They understood Luther and the Reformation to harmonize with their new hierarchy of values. This led to an entirely paradoxical situation: what is objectively the very opposite of Christianity was considered good Protestantism and, therefore, good Christianity.

Through its connection with the Enlightenment, Protestantism was burdened with a purely secularist, non-Christian character, from which it has not been able so far entirely to free itself. The viewpoint of the Enlightenment, not of traditional Christianity, accounts for the fact that the famous evangelical theologians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries denied the divinity of Christ and, nevertheless, called themselves evangelical.

The theological work of Protestantism in the nineteenth century gives unmistakable witness to the transformation of Protestantism by

the secularistic, rationalistic, and sometimes atheistic spirit of the modern world. By rejecting inspiration and declaring part of the New Testament text not genuine, Bible-criticism deprived Protestantism of its original Reformation basis for belief. The Church was considered an organization of later Christians and, therefore, since it was not founded by Christ, it was judged to be without authority. Thanks to such theological preparation, the man on the street several generations later feels himself justified in considering the Bible a book of myths and the Church a dusty relic.

Resurgence of Evangelical Protestantism

But this is only one direction of the ambivalent Protestant development. The other direction is marked by its close dependence on the Bible, but even more by what could be called its connection with tradition. In the evangelical church communities there are two components: the ecumenical, which draws on the tradition of faith that is common to the whole of Christianity, and the dogmatic-confessional, which goes back to the special norms of the reformers preserved by the different confessions. Orthodox Protestantism, which in the nineteenth century was without visible power, and was conservative but not creative, is emerging in the twentieth century as a creative force in the world. This resurgence has brought with it a deeper examination of Reformation theology and a new approach to Sacred Scripture.

The documents of the world synod of Protestantism at Amsterdam in 1948 testify to the forces and tensions that are present in contemporary Protestantism. Great as are the differences among the many evangelical communities in confession and organization, the basic division in Protestantism is that between positive believers and liberals. For example, in Switzerland free-thinking theologians are carrying on a strong battle against the dogmatic confessional movement "lest," they say, "our people's church become a church of salvation through orthodox faith alone."

This liberalism is indeed a mark of Protestantism in our day, but it does not go unchallenged. In Switzerland itself positive theologians have warned against such evangelical freedom. They argue that unrestrained freedom of belief and teaching, freedom to choose between belief and unbelief, to choose to recognize Christ or not, cannot be reconciled with the essence of the church.

The cleavage between "free" and confessionally-bound Christians is not always easy to trace, for they are by no means agreed as to what a creed is or which is the right creed. This came out clearly in the evangelical and Orthodox criticism of Amsterdam.

Amsterdam Synod

The Amsterdam Synod sought to gather together evangelical Christianity of the whole world and to proceed to a sympathetic co-operation with the Orthodox and even the Roman Church. To render this co-operation possible it was first necessary to find forms of agreement among the evangelicals themselves. To find such a formula was one, though not the sole, purpose of the world synod. The basis for belief on which they united was very loose and general. The church communities taking part in the congress recognized a belief in Jesus Christ as their Saviour, but did not lay down any Trinitarian creed.

In the assembly there were two fundamentally divergent outlooks. One, called the "Protestant" or

"left" wing, thought of a rapprochement (or even synthesis) of the present doctrinal creeds that would be achieved by cutting off doctrinal points on which there were contradictory views. A "right" or "Catholic" wing held to its confessionally defined truth and maintained that it would be extremely difficult to unite Protestants because of the patently contradictory positions held by the individual groups, particularly in questions that dealt with the structure and authority of the church.

The prominent American theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, wrote in criticism: "The congress was as depressing as it was joyful, because it is so evident that most churches today still contend that they have the only correct order, theology, or way of life."

What was bewailed by the left wing is, however, the very key to the strength of the right wing (to which belong the Lutherans, Orthodox, and Anglicans). These groups, and particularly the Orthodox, point to the heart of the matter when they make their co-operation in the ecumenical movement depend on the question of dogmatic truth.

Evangelical Organizations

In the same year in which the Amsterdam Synod met, all the evangelical regional churches, the very liberal church of Bremen excepted, united in the "Evangelical Church in Germany" (EKD), which gives in miniature a picture of the generally strained situation existing in world Protestantism.

The Lutheran regional churches formed at the same time and at the same place (Eisenach, 1948) the "United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany" (VELKD), which they regard as the true church. They say that the EKD lacks unity of belief and doctrine and, therefore, is not a church but a league of churches.

To summarize the situation, these points are currently accepted: The EKD is an ecclesiastical league or federation of churches which embraces three church groups which differ from each other in organization and differ as to their theological conception of what the church is. They are split in doctrine and cult, even on important questions such as baptism and marriage. The point that must not be overlooked is that the single communities of EKD (and this is particularly true of the Lutherans) are in themselves more highly unified than is EKD.

Despite differences in doctrine and organization, there must be noted in this association of the evangelical churches a sharpened consciousness of church and a new determination to be earnest about belief, to see and order the world from the viewpoint of faith. The transforming power of this new atmosphere is having its effect. A few examples from their theology will exemplify this fact and at the same time serve as a conclusion to this article.

Focal Points in Theology

The three main theological questions of this revival are: 1) the question of Scripture and creed; 2) the question of the Lord's Supper; 3) the theology of the church.

As regards the first, it is being suggested that the norm of evangelical teaching as contained in the confessional writings is not only subject to correction but is occasionally found to be at variance with the Scriptures, and therefore false.

The theological significance of the Lord's Supper is very much in flux. The aim of research is to learn what the Lord's Supper is accord-

ing to the institution and will of Christ. Exegesis of the New Testament accounts is leading many Lutheran theologians very close to the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and representation.

Much the same question is asked about the Church: What is the Church according to the will of Christ, the teaching of the New Testament, and the practice of Apostolic times? The primacy of Peter is regarded as an exegetical problem, which is solved by several exegetes in a Catholic sense. Another problem is the succession of Peter and the Apostles. The possibility of a Catholic solution to these problems is at least open.

Practically, the strict Lutherans and the Lutheran-influenced united regional churches are developing monarchical episcopal churches. For instance, according to new statutes the evangelical bishop of Berlin-Brandenburg, together with the general superintendents, exercises the office of vigilance over doctrine and instructs the pastors. He alone ordains matters spiritual; he represents the church to externs. In several other regional churches the bishop is irremovable and has therefore, practically if not theoretically, an indelible character.

The doctrine on baptism adopted by the general synod at Ansbach in June, 1950, not only asserts a positive teaching about the nature of baptism, but definitely condemns five errors pertaining to it, among them being the "false interpretation that baptism of infants contradicts the apostolic teaching on baptism." Similar definitions, though not yet approved, are proposed in regard to confirmation, marriage, and divine service.

Finally, in regard to Catholicism there are in Protestantism many shades of opinion, ranging from the calumnies of the malicious and from well-meaning lack of understanding, to informed discussion, ecumenical openness, preparedness for understanding, and actual proximity.

Whither the discussion of the more Catholic party will lead is a question to which we do not as yet have an answer. There remains the hope and prayer that with the help of God and through His grace Christians will again become one. Until that is achieved we must never grow weary in our search for possibilities of reuniting all Christians into the one Church.

MATTER AND FORM OF PENANCE

E. J. Hegarty, "The Matter and Form of Penance," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* 76(1951), pp. 111-115.

An article entitled "La matière du sacrement de pénitence," published by Father L. Baudiment in *L'Année Théologique,* 5(1944), pp. 209-217, proposed a new solution for the age-old problem of defining the matter and form of the Sacrament of Penance. Whether or not his suggestions will be accepted by theologians remains to be seen. In the article which is here abstracted, Father Hegarty summarizes the main points of Baudiment's position and expresses the hope that discussion about this newest explanation may lead to a final solution of the problem.

The Problem. In the Sacrament of Penance, it is generally accepted that actual sins are not the remote matter, but the *materia circa quam* (that about which the Sacrament is concerned), and that the sacrament has no other remote matter. The dispute arises in connection with the proximate matter and the form. Thomists hold that the three acts of the penitent are the proximate matter; Scotists

hold that the essence of the sacrament is entirely in the absolution and that the penitent's acts are merely conditions.

The Remote Matter of Penance. Father Baudiment maintains that the three acts of the penitent are the remote matter. He supports this opinion by appealing to the *Decretum pro Armenis* of the Council of Florence, which lists the matter of the various sacraments: the matter of Baptism is water; of Confirmation, chrism; of the Eucharist, wheat bread and wine from grapes; of Penance the quasi-matter is the acts of the penitent; of Extreme Unction the matter is oil. By "quasi-matter" the council did not mean that the acts of the penitent are not truly the matter of Penance, but that they are not material things as are the matter in other sacraments. Father Baudiment argues that since the matter indicated for the other sacraments is remote matter, the matter mentioned for Penance must also be remote matter.

Proximate Matter of Penance. Father Baudiment rejects both the Thomist and Scotist opinions as insufficient and maintains that the proximate matter of Penance can only be the judicial action which the priest exercises upon the acts of the penitent. This judicial action is distinct from the absolution, to which it is a natural prelude. It is applied to the penitent's acts (the remote matter) by the priest, who thus submits the penitent's acts to the sentence of absolution. In this opinion, the minister of Penance brings the remote matter into play by his own action.

The Form of Penance. Father Baudiment agrees with all other theologians that the absolution is the form of Penance, but maintains that his theory explains the causal role of the form more accurately than the other theories do. The words of absolution elevate the priest's judicial action, which otherwise might be an act of some merely human judgment, to the supernatural and sacramental sphere.

The Minister of Penance. Confirmation of this opinion is found in the fact that one single minister is necessary for Penance. The necessity of a single minister can be justified only by an appeal to the formal causality exercised by the form. Since the form is an intrinsic specifying element it cannot be applied externally by a different person, but must be pronounced by the same minister who applies the proximate matter (even though he does not also supply the remote matter). The clear concept of a formal cause shows that the priest who pronounces the form of absolution must also have something to do with the matter of Penance, i.e. with the contrition, confession, and satisfaction of the penitent. Some other activity, besides absolution, must be exercised by the priest himself in regard to these three acts. This is provided for in Father Baudiment's opinion that the judicial action of the priest is the proximate matter.

Practical Application. Strict Thomists can justify the absolving of an unconscious person only by appeal to the probability of opposing theories. Father Baudiment can deal with this case on his own grounds: A judicial action can, in exceptional cases, follow an extremely summary inquiry; sentence can be pronounced suspensorily, conditionally, or upon a passive or distant person; and it can be based on evidence of a third party, on circumstantial evidence, or even on reasonable conjecture or presumption. It is possible, in this view, to deal with extreme cases without any sacrifice of principles, an advantage which other schools of thought do not enjoy and one which gives added weight to this new speculation in sacramental theology.

"A perpetual and varied service is required of philosophy, in order that sacred theology may receive and assume the nature, form, and genius of a true science. For in this, the most noble of studies, it is of the greatest necessity to bind together, as it were, into one body the many and various parts of the heavenly doctrine, that, each being allotted its own proper place and derived from its own proper principles, they may form a well-ordered whole." Pope Leo XIII.

THE PRIESTHOOD of THE FAITHFUL

Msgr. H. Francis Davis

This digest of the article of Monsignor Davis, which originally appeared in The Downside Review, *69(1951), pp. 155-170, treats a topic which has been much discussed in recent years. One of the most valuable contributions on the subject has been* Le Sacerdoce Royal des Fidèles *by Father Paul Dabin, S.J. The first volume gives the Scriptural basis of the doctrine, the second collects the testimony of Tradition. This second volume occasioned Monsignor Davis's article.*

The newly-awakened interest in the priesthood of the faithful is due to several factors. First of all, there is the deepening of our understanding and appreciation of the doctrine of the Mystical Body, which stresses the particular functions of all the members of the Church, laity as well as clergy. A second factor is the desire to find as much theological support as possible for the lay apostolate, coupled with an anxiety to revive and increase the love of the Church's liturgical life and to find a doctrinal basis for an appeal to the laity to take an active part in the liturgy. Yet another factor is the revival of sacramental theology, especially that of the sacramental character which is connected with the priesthood.

The doctrine is, as far as Scripture goes, based mainly upon two passages in I Peter and two passages in the Apocalypse. St. Peter states that the Jews, a "priestly kingdom and a holy nation" (Exod. 19-6) prior to their rejection of Christ, have been superseded by the Christians, who are, in a new and special way, "a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (I Peter 2:5). Christians are now "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people" (I Peter 2:9).

St. John treats Christians more individually, in contrast to the collective terminology of St. Peter. He speaks of all who died for Christ, and of all who refused to worship the beast. ". . . They will be priests of God and Christ, and will reign with him a thousand years" (Apoc. 20:6). St. John speaks in similar language in an earlier chapter when he records the hymn of the elders in the presence of the Lamb: ". . . (Thou) hast made them for our God a kingdom and priests, and they shall reign over the earth" (Apoc. 5:10). These passages of St. John suggest a connection with the sacramental character in so far as the seal on the foreheads of the elect is clearly opposed to the mark of the beast. Moreover they look back to the prophecies of Isaias and Ezechiel foretelling a messianic kingdom in which all will be priests of the Lord and ministers of our God, and prophesying a repentant people marked with a cross. On the basis of these passages, the Christian priesthood has always been considered *anagogic,* i.e., looking forward to our state of glory. Here below we share Christ's priesthood in a way

which is imperfect compared with the share we shall have when we worship God in heaven.

Father Dabin's book, with its two to three hundred witnesses from Fathers, theologians, and ecclesiastical documents, shows us that not one in five of these even think of applying these passages to the clergy in orders, as such. And even those who do refer these passages to the clergy do so without prejudice to the general priesthood of the faithful.

The Fathers, in interpreting these passages and texts in which the Christian is said to be anointed, as a rule think more of a collective priesthood, although they never exclude the idea that an individual share in the priesthood belongs to every Christian in so far as he is a member of Christ. From the moment he puts on Christ, he partakes of Christ's priestly worship of the Father.

At the moment, it is important for the understanding of this priesthood of the faithful to note that, in the Church's tradition before the Reformation, it is rarely found compared with the priesthood of orders. Its term of comparison is always the non-priesthood of the non-baptized. St. Peter writes: "You who in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God . . ." (I Peter 2:10). By baptism we become the *Laos,* the laity, and as such incomparably above those not yet joined to Christ. The unbaptized are unconsecrated; Christians are consecrated. It is unfortunate that the word "laity" has almost lost its original connotation of a consecrated people and come to be used merely to denote that one is not a member of the clergy.

When this contrast between the consecrated people and the rest of mankind is kept in mind, it will readily be seen that the priesthood of the laity, far from being a mere metaphor, involves a status and perfection given through the Sacraments of initiation. Specifically, the superiority of the Christian over the non-Christian applies not only to the indirect share which every Christian has in the Church's worship, but also to the active and passive powers conferred by the sacramental character.

This indirect share in the Church's worship consists in this: The faithful are invited to join in the Mass by offering themselves to God from the moment of the Offertory, and they are told to "live their Mass," to offer at that Mass their lives during the day. Thus their personal sacrifice is one with the whole Church's sacrifice, and one with Christ's; thus their daily life is consecrated and immolated by the priest who represents Christ, and who, as His divinely appointed minister and delegate, publicly and externally offers sacrifice for the faithful who belong to Christ.

But in addition to this right and duty to immolate himself together with Christ, the layman is also called upon to join, perhaps in a manner more passive than active, with the priest in actually offering Christ to the Father. Christ offers this Eucharistic Sacrifice pre-eminently as the principal offerer; the priest in sacred orders is Christ's minister in this Eucharistic offering, and the layman is appointed to join with Christ and His Church in offering the divine Victim through the same ministry. The truth of this is expressed by many prayers of the Liturgy, e.g., the *Orate Fratres,* and is substantiated by the fact that the prayers by which the divine Victim is offered to God are said for the most part in the plural and indicate more than once that the people have a part in the sacrifice as being co-offerers of it.

Pius XII in his Encyclical *Mediator Dei* fully accepts St. Thomas's teaching that this power of offering

Mass with the priest, as well as the power of taking part in other official Christian acts of worship, belongs to the Christian in virtue of his sacramental character. He further states that when the priest actually offers up Christ's sacrifice in the way in which he alone can do it, the people may be said to offer it by his hands and with him.

St. Thomas was the first to formulate clearly the doctrine that the priesthood of the faithful is identified with the sacramental character, and to base this doctrine on the double aspect of the Sacraments. Thus he gave accurate expression to the implicit faith of earlier centuries and won the unanimous acceptance of subsequent theologians.

The Sacraments have a double aspect: as means of sanctification, they confer grace; as acts of worship, they possess the character under discussion. Of the four Sacraments more directly related to worship, the Eucharist is the central act of worship itself, while baptism, confirmation, and orders depute to a man such a share in the priesthood as will enable him to perform these acts of worship.

The principal effect of the character of orders is to give to the clergy the power to confer the Sacraments, to be the instruments of grace for others. On the other hand, the characters of baptism and confirmation are primarily passive, since through them the faithful can receive other Sacraments validly and be offered with Christ in the Mass. However, St. Thomas does not regard them as wholly passive, for they apparently give to the Christian the power to confer matrimony, to provide actively the quasi-matter for penance, and to take an active part in defending the interests of the Church and undertaking the apostolate of Catholic Action. Moreover, the early Church believed that the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, first promised to Christ for His kingly office, were received by the Christian initiates in confirmation. Hence, since the kingly office cannot be separated from the priestly office, all Christians must, through the reception of confirmation, have some share in the priestly office.

This consideration shows how right Father Dabin is in not allowing the Christian's share in Christ's office to be confined to the priesthood of worship. It must extend to the wider mediatorship involved in the offices of king and prophet. The reception of the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, promised to Christ for His kingly office, and the union, through the anointing and consecration, of all Christians with Christ in the work of redemption, make each and every Christian a cooperator with the hierarchy in bringing God to men and in witnessing God before men. This great work of the Church is shared by all Christians, for the Spirit of God infuses the whole Body, the laity as well as the hierarchy. For this reason the Popes have always been influenced by the consent of the faithful (*consensus fidelium*), and theologians have regarded it as a legitimate source of theological knowledge (*locus theologicus*).

Although there may be some difficulty encountered in choosing an apt and agreeable terminology to express this doctrine of the royal priesthood of the laity, the question of terms is not serious and has rarely led to any widespread error among Catholics. I would suggest that the safest distinction is between the *priesthood of the laity* (or of the *faithful*) and *the priesthood, tout court,* adding the words *of orders* or *ordained* only when necessary to avoid ambiguity.

At any rate, whatever terminology is used, it is clear from the virtually unanimous witness of the Fathers

and other documents up to the present day that the priesthood of the faithful can no more be dismissed as a mere metaphor, than can the fact that the faithful are one with Christ, consecrated and set apart, the people of God. Only those who are ordained can say Mass and confer most of the Sacraments, and they alone are Christ's ministers to make present again His immolation and His power in a visible way in the daily Christian sacrifice. But the laity can confer some Sacraments, and receive others in the manner laid down by the Church. And although they do not represent God before men, and men before God, as the official public ministers of the Church, still they do in their own way, always in full obedience to The Vicar of Christ and to those in holy orders under him, share in this duty and office of the Church.

In summary, then, the laity, both individually and collectively, and in a manner more passive than active, share in the priesthood of Christ, both in its restricted meaning of worship and in its wider meaning of the kingly and prophetic offices. This share of Christ's priesthood, identical with the sacramental character, is given to them in baptism and perfected, especially as regards the royal and prophetic offices, in confirmation. Many Fathers teach that the external sign that is given is the non-sacramental anointing of baptism and the probably-sacramental anointing of confirmation. As the basis of both rights and duties, this priesthood of the laity must always be understood without prejudice to the rights and duties of the priesthood of orders.

God has given the Church a royal priesthood which embraces all Christ's members, and it is their office by prayer, interior sacrifice, and action to distribute the blessings from heaven preserved or brought down anew by the Pope, the bishops, and priests in holy orders.

RELATED BIBLIOGRAPHY (cf. p. 31)

L. Cerfaux, "Regale Sacerdotium," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques,* 28(1939), pp. 5-39.

Y. Congar, O.P., "Structure du sacerdoce chrétien," *La Maison-Dieu,* no. 27, pp. 51-85. "Sacerdoce et laïcat," *Vie Intellectuelle,* 14(1946), Dec., p. 23. See also the book *Théologie du Laïcat* which Fr. Congar will publish in the near future.

P. Dabin, S.J., *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans les Livres Saints,* Paris, Bloud and Gay, 1941. *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans la tradition ancienne et moderne,* Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1950. See also his book *L'Apostolat laïque,* Paris, 1933.

G. de Broglie, "Du rôle de l'Eglise dans le sacrifice eucharistique," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* 70(1948), pp. 449-460. "La messe, oblation collective de la communauté chrétienne," *Gregorianum,* 30(1949), pp. 534-561.

Bernard Durst, O.S.B., *Dreifaches Priestertum,* Nerresheim, 1947 (2nd edit.).

J. Lécuyer, C.S.Sp., "Essai sur le sacerdoce des fidèles chez les Pères," *La Maison-Dieu,* no. 27 (1951), pp. 7-50.

P. Palmer, S. J., "Lay Priesthood: Real or Metaphorical," *Theological Studies,* 8(1947), pp. 574-613. "Lay Priesthood: Towards a Terminology," *Theol. Studies,* 10(1949), pp. 235-250.

J. Rea, *The Common Priesthood of the Members of the Mystical Body,* Westminster (Maryland), Newman, 1947.

La participation active des fidèles au culte (Cours et Conferences des Semains Liturgiques, vol. 11), Louvain, 1933.

A. Thiry, S.J., "L'Encyclique 'Mediator Dei' sur la liturgie," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* 70(1948), pp. 113-136.

S. Tromp, S.J., "Quo sensu in Sacrificio Missae offerat Ecclesia, offerant fideles," *Periodica,* 30(1941), pp. 265-273.

Christ in the Psalms

Balthasar Fischer

Originally a lecture delivered at the University of Bonn in 1946, this article appeared under the title "Le Christ dans les Psaumes" in La Maison-Dieu, *no. 27(1951), pp. 86-109. This article is a good illustration of the interrelationship of the work being done in different branches of theology, for it shows how liturgists in studying the roots of the Church's ritual have encountered the problem of the meanings of Scripture. (See the digest on p. 15.) A book to be published soon under the editorship of M. Mathis, C.S.C., will contain the lecture "The Psalter as a Christian Prayerbook" which Dr. Fischer delivered in the summer of 1950 at Notre Dame University.*

The publication of the new Psalter on March 24, 1945, drew attention again to the old question: How can the Church of the New Testament consider as her own a book of prayers which first was given to the people of the Old Covenant; how can she address Christ and the Father in expressions borrowed from the period of revelation that is superseded; how can she use the songs of Israel which are conditioned in so large a measure by circumstances of time, population, and place?

To discover how the Psalter of the Old Testament became the prayer book of the Church of the New Testament, we must examine the devotion to the Psalms of those who in the pre-Constantine Age of the Martyrs introduced them into the Christian Church.

The theory that the apostolic churches mechanically inherited the Psalms from the synagogue has become for the most part untenable since the studies of Joseph Kroll and other scholars. According to the well-founded thesis of Rudolph Knopf, the Psalter appears to have been first used as part of the liturgical reading of the prophecies. It seems that it was adopted as a book of liturgical chant only toward the beginning of the third century, when the Church, reacting against the Gnostic perversion of hymns, turned to the Bible for her chant. If this is so, if the Psalter was not simply preserved as a pious relic of the synagogue, but succeeded in supplanting the living hymns of the primitive Church, we can already admit that the Church has shown a very special interest in this book.

Reasons for Adopting the Psalms

When we examine the earliest records of the Age of the Martyrs, we find that the Psalms are the most frequently cited of all the books of the Old Testament. Why this preference? Was it because the Psalter is so profoundly human, or because any monotheist can find in it suitable matter for prayer to God? These are not the basic reasons for the joy which the Church of the Martyrs found in the Psalms. Indeed, the early Church would have denied that the Psalms were suitable prayer for all monotheists, since she recognized in the "Theos" of the Psalms the Father of her Lord, Jesus Christ.

Did the Church have a special love for the Psalter because, unlike other books of prayer, it alone is inspired? The response is clearly affirmative, but this still does not give the decisive reason.

Is it, then, because in the Psalms there are passages which, in the light of the New Testament, can be understood as Messianic prophe-

cies? This again is true, but it is an inadequate explanation. The Church of the Martyrs did not love the Psalter because a handful of Messianic passages illumined the obscure remainder of the book. Rather, the entire Psalter was for her a prophetic book fulfilled in Christ; in each Psalm, Christ speaks, or is spoken of, or is spoken to. While writers of the Age of Martyrs frequently embellish their writings by citing the Psalms in their literal sense, they make it clear that for them the essential thing is the Christological interpretation of the Psalms.

"Christologizing" the Psalms

We must now follow in detail the path which the Church of the Martyrs followed in this "Christologizing" of the Psalter. We shall begin by eliminating the few Psalms which Christian exegetes today consider as Messianic in their immediate sense. The interpretation of the remainder of the Psalms is based upon a two-fold typology, according as the Psalm is the voice of a single person or the voice of the people.

Wherever in the Psalms a single person speaks, whether it be David, or the king, or the persecuted innocent one, or the just man who is saved, the primitive Church heard the voice of Christ. Wherever we hear the voice of the people of the Old Covenant, there it is the new and true Israel, the Church, which speaks. *The Psalms are the words of Christ! The Psalms are the words of the Church!* The genius of Augustine will one day blend these two perspectives into one: *The Psalms are the words of the whole Christ, head and body.*

It is important to note that the second of these classes of Psalms is equally applicable to Christ, whether the Church speaks of Christ to the Father or directly addresses the Psalm to Christ. In the first case, where the person speaking in the Psalm and the person reciting the Psalm are identified in Christ, we remain in the realm of typology. Here the application of the Psalm to Christ has its origin in the human elements of the Psalm, and we can call the process "Christologizing from below." But in the second case the divine elements of the Psalm are applied to Christ; the God whom the people address is Christ descended among men. We can call this "Christologizing from above." The phenomenon of exegesis which we encounter here does not pertain strictly to the realm of typology, but to something more embracing: the Christian sense of fulfillment. Taking account of the distinction just made, we can modify our two previous fundamental expressions to the more precise form: *The Psalms are the words of Christ to the Father; the Psalms are the words of the Church to the Father about Christ; the Psalms are the words of the Church to Christ.*

These three expressions, however, show us only how the first Christians interpreted those parts of the Psalter which contain a prayer properly so called. This is about two-thirds of the entire Psalter. For the other third, written in the third person, we must use another expression: *the Psalms are words about Christ.*

Here the Christological interpretation is made in two ways: when the Psalm speaks about creatures, either persons or things, these are viewed as types fulfilled in Christ; when the Psalm speaks about God, we understand it to speak about Christ as God.

The Psalms as Prayer to Christ

Among these Christological interpretations of the Psalms adopted by the Church of the Martyrs, the

theme *The Psalms are the words of Christ* occupies the principal place. This probably came about because of the special catechetical value of such a typological interpretation. For the early Christian catechists what better illustration could be found of their favorite theological principle that it was the Logos who spoke through the prophets? It is good to remember that before the Psalter was adopted as a book of chant, it was used as a book of reading, and liturgical reading has always been directed to catechetical instruction. Under such conditions, a typological interpretation of the Psalms could not fail to be popular.

With the adoption of the psalmody properly so-called, and with the antiphonal chant of the subsequent period, the theme *The Psalms are the words of the Church to Christ* gains the ascendancy. The personal piety of these early Christians who adopted the Psalms as their book of prayer preferred a text which permitted them to pray *to* Christ rather than *through* Christ (the usual form of priestly prayer in the liturgy). We find this orientation of prayer already in St. Paul (II Cor. 12:8; I Tim. 1:12), and it has a prominent place in the piety of the martyrs and in the apocryphal writings of apostolic times. At times this *to Christ* of the early Christians has a characteristically mediaeval tone; certain prayers to Jesus in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (Sayings of the Fathers), a work somewhat later than the period we are considering, and in Origen's homilies remind one of St. Bernard. An atmosphere in which the *to Christ* plays such a prominent role was a favorable climate for psalmody addressed to Christ.

Moreover, the early Christians themselves certainly realized that the very quality that makes the Psalter a model of popular prayer, that is, its "eruptive" power, its bursting from the depths of the human heart immersed in sin but aspiring to beatitude, could retain its full effectiveness only if the Psalms are interpreted as *words to Christ*.

To our modern way of thinking and speaking, the many passages of the Psalms which deal with God's creative activity and His action in the Old Covenant clearly exclude a Christological interpretation. To us, it does not seem appropriate to say of Christ or to Christ that He created the world or that He brought the Chosen People out of Egypt. The early Christians thought otherwise; indeed, they were fond of attributing creation to the Son and of seeing the activity of the Logos in the Old Testament.

The traces of psalmodic prayer to Christ in the period under consideration merit close attention. Origen's testimony is particularly important because in his sermons he constantly uses passages of the Psalms as addressed to Christ, even though theoretically and theologically he was opposed to prayer to Christ. It would seem that the tide of popular devotion to Christ swept away the theologian.

It is significant, moreover, that in the only two places where we can study devotion to the Psalms as it was expressed in the liturgy of the early Church we find words that refer to Yahweh interpreted as referring to Christ. This is true of Psalm 33:9, "Taste and see that the Lord is sweet," applied to the Eucharist, and of Psalm 22 which is used in the liturgy of baptism. Again, it is not by chance that the two most important Christian additions to the Psalter evidence a "Christologizing from above." These are the celebrated passages from

Psalm 95:10, "The Lord has reigned from the wood," and from Psalm 50:9, "Thou wilt sprinkle me with hyssop by the blood of the wood."

There is, however, no example more characteristic than the extraordinary interpretation given by the Church of the Martyrs to those parts of the psalmody in which man is depicted as seeking refuge under the wings of God. These wings of God are understood to be the outstretched arms of Christ on the Cross.

These last three examples illustrate a final characteristic of the early Christian devotion to the Psalms, its "staurocentric" quality. For example, in African piety during the time of the Decian persecution, Psalms One to Three, which are otherwise completely independent of one another, are understood to have the Cross as a common theme. The Cross is understood to be the "tree of life planted near running waters," the tree of life from which flow the baptismal waters. It is from this tree that the Lord manifests His kingship to the ends of the earth, "I have been appointed king by Him upon Sion, His holy mountain." It is upon this tree that He died in order to rise victorious from the dead, "I lay down and I slept; I arose because the Lord upholds me."

Finally, there remains the question as to how the Church of the Martyrs regarded those passages of the Psalms which do not lend themselves to a Christological interpretation; those, for example, in which the Psalmist deplores the lot of the dead abandoned by God, or in which he breaks into curses. The effort was often made, especially in the Alexandrian school, to minimize the differences between the two Testaments by allegorical devices; but there was also the more sympathetic method of sublimating the text in the spirit of the New Testament. Nor does one have to be so drastic as St. Paul, who (in Eph. 4:8) boldly transforms the exacting Yahweh of Psalm 67 into the beneficent God-King, Jesus Christ, by reading "he gave" in place of "he received gifts." Most often it is enough to add mentally a parenthetical phrase as, many centuries later, did Theresa of the Child Jesus, who wrote that she pronounced only half-heartedly the verse of Psalm 118, "I inclined my heart to your laws because of the reward," and that she hastened to add to herself, "O my Jesus, You know that it is not for any reward that I serve You, but only because I love You and in order to save souls."

Such is the general picture of devotion to the Psalms in the Church of the Martyrs. The Psalter was for these early Christians a book about Christ, a book which sings of the Lord raised upon the Cross. These songs speak of Him, or speak to Him, or show Him speaking to His Father; and of these, the prayer *to* Christ plays the central role. Such is the answer to the question how the primitive Church came to love the Psalter so much and made it ever more definitely the book of song and prayer of the Christian liturgy.

The importance of the conclusion to be drawn from our study is evident. Devotion to the Psalms at the time when our liturgy was formulated was only a further development of the devotion of the Church of the Martyrs. In this perspective, the fundamental formulae which we have examined will be the indispensable basis for all interpretations of the liturgical usage of the Psalms.

Basis in the New Testament

Such an interpretation will necessarily raise a final question. To

what extent can a Christological understanding of the Psalms claim a value independent of time? Does it not, in the final analysis, have its roots in contingent circumstances—for example, in the needs of an anti-Jewish polemic or in the methods of Hellenistic exegesis? No, it is rooted in neither of these; it is clearly founded on the New Testament use of the Psalms. We can point this out only briefly.

For one thing, the New Testament, when it treats of the Old, sees everywhere types of Christ and His people. Allegory, in the strict sense of Philo, is almost completely foreign to it. Again, the Christological meaning given to Theological expressions of the old Testament (what we have called "Christologizing from above") is one of the most distinctive characteristics of the New Testament Christology.

The New Testament itself applies passages of the Psalms to Christ, as the following instances prove. Christ, in John 13:18, cites Psalm 40, where the immediate sense is certainly not Messianic, and sees it fulfilled in the episode of Judas at the Last Supper. Since Christ here recognizes His own voice in that of the persecuted just man, this interpretation fully corresponds to what we have called "Christologizing from below." On the other hand, He does not hesitate, by way of "Christologizing from above," to apply to Himself words in the Psalter that refer to God. In Matthew 21:16, Christ applies to Himself the words of Psalm 8:3 regarding the praise which Yahweh receives from the mouths of children. In Luke 24:44, He expressly declares that the Psalms have a Christological meaning: "All things must be fulfilled that are written . . . in the Psalms concerning me."

Finally, in Acts 7:59, St. Stephen uses as his own the words of Psalm 30 which the Master had addressed to His Father on the Cross. But Stephen does not speak them with Christ to the Father; he addresses them directly to Christ: "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." He here applies the principle of a "Christologizing from above"; and the death prayer of the first martyr becomes the first expression of psalmic prayer to Christ.

It is impossible to dismiss with a wave of the hand an interpretation of the Psalms so clearly founded on the pages of the New Testament. Obviously, there is a great difference between the duty of scientific exegesis to consider primarily what the Psalmist wished to express and the fact of Christian piety being content with this minimum. Christian devotion will always be led to give a Christological interpretation to the Psalter, for only in this way does it gain the fullness of Christian prayer.

To ignore such an interpretation would be to break with a tradition that goes back through the Middle Ages to the Church of the Martyrs, and finds its roots in the New Testament itself.

CHRIST'S PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

Christian imagination and devotion have always been concerned with the physical appearance of Christ, and from time to time attempts are made to prove definitely that Jesus was strikingly handsome or rather ugly. A very sensible survey of the whole question is given by Bernard Leeming, S.J., in two articles in last year's issues of *The Clergy Review* (vol. 37, pp. 257-270, 531-544).

In the first article, Father Leeming discusses the difficulty which arises from the fact that several writers in early centuries, most notably Tertullian, apparently

taught that Christ was ugly. After listing and explaining the principles which guided the patristic writers in their discussions about the physical beauty or ugliness of Christ, Father Leeming concludes that the writers of these early centuries were not concerned with the historical question as to whether Christ was handsome.

The main concern of these early writers was to defend the real humanity of Christ and the truth of His teaching; these objectives overshadowed the purely historical fact of Christ's appearance. Against the Gnostics who argued that Christ must have had a truly God-like appearance, the patristic writers maintained that there was nothing conspicuous about Christ's physical appearance, for God's plan for the Incarnation and Redemption involved the choice of an ordinary and humble life. Christ's real beauty was His divinity, His moral character, and the immortality He brought to the body.

To worldly wisdom the Cross is unappealing; Christ in His Passion appears unattractive and ugly. But this pertains not so much to bodily appearance as to the moral implications of His suffering: Christ's renunciation of pride, self-indulgence, and worldly success. To those who had the spiritual capacity to see things truly Jesus appeared most attractive. How else would He have drawn little children to Himself, or so many men and women to enter His service?

There is, then, no historical evidence about the appearance of Christ. Moreover, there seems to be no justification for saying that Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, or any other early Christian writer taught that Christ was ugly.

In more modern times, some theologians have adduced reasons in an attempt to prove either that Christ was the handsomest of men, or that He was very unprepossessing. Father Leeming, in his second article, weighs these various theological arguments and then draws his own conclusions.

Some have supposed that if Christ had been afflicted with some physical deformity or ailment He would have suffered more in redeeming men and He would have been more sympathetic. However, this reasoning is based on the false assumptions that the value of Christ's satisfaction comes from the amount of suffering and that the basis of human sympathy is some particular personal suffering. The value of Christ's satisfaction springs radically from His divine personality, and His sympathy is grounded in the common nature that He shares with other men, and finds its immediate source in Christ's understanding heart.

On the other hand, though purely scriptural evidence leaves the question quite open, there are some Gospel indications that Christ's physical appearance was appealing.

It is clear that Jesus attracted children, that He talked at length to crowds without wearying them, that many conceived a deep human affection for Him: things which suggest a certain human attractiveness. Besides, from the strenuous type of life that Christ and His Apostles led it seems that He enjoyed soundness of body and robust health.

Theological reasoning from a number of principles seems to point to the fact that Christ had a definitely gracious and attractive appearance without being conspicuously handsome. There could be no physical flaw in Christ that came either from birth or personal accident. Besides, we can assume that Christ is, in every sense, the kind of man God wanted and envisaged in creating man. In Christ, the idea of manhood finds its best expression. Then, too, since Christ's body, which was whole and sound, formed a natural unity with His soul, there must have been some reflection in His body of the nobility of His soul.

These arguments seem to show quite clearly that Jesus was becoming and even noble in appearance, but the simple fact is that we are not certain how He looked.

Ecclesiastical Faith:
A MODERN MISCONCEPTION

Most Rev. Fidel G. Martínez, D.D.

Protestants frequently object that Catholic dogma is totally unlike the belief of primitive Christianity. Catholics reply that their doctrine is the growth, the development of the seed planted by the preaching of the Apostles. Bishop Martínez maintains that the notion of "ecclesiastical faith" as an assent distinct from "divine faith" renders impossible any explanation of this development of dogma. In this article from Revista Española de Teología, 11 *(1951), pp. 209-253 he answers certain objections raised against his position.*

We propose in this study to examine some objections raised against our 1946 article of the same title. We will first present our opponents' position.

Position of Father Lennerz

In his treatise on the theological virtues Father Lennerz thus syllogizes our position: What God attests as true must be believed with divine faith. But what the Church defines, God attests as true. Therefore, what the Church defines must be believed with divine faith. In other words, God has formally revealed the Church's universal infallibility. But thereby He has revealed it in the concrete. Therefore, He has revealed the truth of the concrete Church definition.

Father Lennerz answers: God has revealed that this is a *true definition;* we cannot conclude necessarily that He has revealed the truth defined. Father Lennerz illustrates this distinction with a series of examples.

1. Peter testifies: What Paul affirms is true, for he is reliable. Paul testifies: John was here; I saw him myself. Now, I believe Peter testifying to Paul's reliability and Paul to John's presence. But, I do not believe Peter testifying to John's presence, for he may know nothing of this.

2. A pastor testifies: What God affirms is absolutely true. God testifies: The Word was made flesh. Now, I believe the pastor testifying to God's truthfulness and God testifying to the Incarnation. But, I do not believe the pastor testifying to the Incarnation, for he has not told me this.

3. A pastor testifies: The Church defining is infallible. The Church testifies: St. Anthony is in heaven. Once again, I do not believe the pastor testifying to St. Anthony's presence in heaven.

4. God testifies: The Church defining is infallible. The Church testifies: St. Anthony is in heaven. I cannot believe God testifying to St. Anthony's presence in heaven, for He has not told me this.

Objections of Father Aldama

In the recently published *Summa of Sacred Theology* Father Aldama thus presents his criticism of our opinion: The virtually revealed truth is not of divine faith *before* the Church's definition because it lacks divine testimony. But the Church's definition cannot give divine testimony, for such a definition remains the voice of the Church (not of God) through divine assistance (not revelation). Therefore, even *after* the Church's definition a virtually revealed truth cannot be the object of divine faith.

Father Aldama continues: To say that God has revealed the infallibility of a definition but not the truth defined is not quibbling, but is an attempt to keep the essential difference between God's assistance and His revelation. The fact that God has revealed the infallibility of the Church does not mean that He has revealed the individual propositions which are infallibly true. God, it is true, does know the individual truths defined by the Church; but, the question is not what God *knows*, but what He *says*.

Clarifying Some Basic Notions

Before answering these objections, we must clarify certain apparently fundamental ideas which have caused our opponents serious trouble.

When we affirm a truth through another's testimony, we must see whether we affirm the truthfulness of the testifier or the truth of the testimony itself. For truth of testimony can exist apart from truthfulness of the testifier (a usually unreliable witness attests what is true); and truthfulness of the testifier can exist without truth of testimony (a usually reliable witness attests what is not true).

Now, an act of faith is not really such unless it is made precisely in virtue of the *intrinsic* truthfulness of the testifier, for it is an intellectual homage to his person. An assent made for motives extrinsic to this truthfulness is either an act of knowledge or not an act of faith in *this* testifier. Thus, if I accept Peter's testimony that he has been in Rome, solely because he speaks of persons and things which he could not otherwise know, I do not make an act of faith, but of knowledge. Similarly, if I accept Peter's testimony solely because John confirms its truth, I make an act of faith not in Peter, but in John.

Certain conclusions follow from this analysis.

1. Whenever we affirm the intrinsic truthfulness of a witness, we can accept his testimony with an act of faith in *him*. Whenever we affirm the truth alone of a testimony, without reaching the intrinsic truthfulness of the testifier, we accept the testimony with an act of faith not in *him*, but only in another witness who confirms the truth in question. Whenever the truthfulness of the testifier infallibly produces truth of testimony, we affirm the two as necessary correlatives.

2. Whenever we accept the testimony of a witness of dubious truthfulness (an idiot's), we must admit that we do not believe in *him*, but in something extrinsic to him. Similarly, if our assent to the testimony of a defectible witness is irrevocable, our assent, as irrevocable, is not made to him.

Critique of Father Lennerz

In the light of these notions, let us examine Father Lennerz's examples.

In affirming the truth of God's or the Church's testimony, the pastor affirms the *truthfulness* of these witnesses. This truthfulness is the sole motive which the pastor possesses and the sole motive he transmits to his hearers. Naturally, these latter assent to the testimony only because of this same veracity. But let us suppose that the pastor knows of St. Anthony's presence in heaven through a private revelation. In this case he might well *confirm* the testimony in question and deserve an act of faith in his own word. And, if the truthfulness of the Church were not known, assent to the testimony in question could exist only by reason of the truthfulness of the pastor.

We come to the fourth example, the most important one. God af-

firms the infallibility of the Church as necessarily achieving its effect —immunity from error. He has also told us of something which sees to it that these definitions are absolutely true—the divine assistance.

These, then, the fact of infallibility and its mode of realization, are the realities revealed by God and the only facts which the theologian should take into count in forming his judgment. Yet, because our human conceptions are abstractive, we tend to create rational entities which cause us to falsify reality. Thus we easily imagine infallibility as something existing by itself, with its own attributes and qualities. What, in reality, is it?

On one hand, we have a Pope, by himself or with his bishops, who utters a definition on faith or morals; on the other, God's promise that He will not permit any such definitions to be false. These two elements, and these alone, constitute infallibility.

Now God's assistance is completely *extrinsic* to the Church (even Father Lennerz admits that ecclesiastical faith is only extrinsically infallible). Since the *intrinsic* truthfulness of the Pope is a human attribute, it remains intrinsically defectible, even with the divine assistance. Therefore, it cannot found an irrevocable assent. If such an assent exists, it must be founded on an extrinsic motive—God's assistance.

Some Misconceptions

Before continuing this analysis, let us clear away two misconceptions:

1. We do not confuse God's assistance and His revelation. Our thesis rests solely on God's having attested that the Church's definitions are infallible.

2. In no way is it our concern to question that definitions are "the voice of the *Church*." We merely say that as proceeding from the Church they are of human authority, and as such, cannot found an irrevocable assent. We also maintain that just as the testimony of one witness can be confirmed by another, so too the Church's definitions are ratified and guaranteed by God. In other words, "St. Anthony is in heaven" is the Church's statement; "This definition is true" is God's statement.

The Core of the Dispute

God, as our opponents concede, has revealed that all the Church's definitions are infallible. Together with all other theologians, they admit that revealing a universal principle entails the revelation of each of its particulars. But, they *deny* that affirming the truth of a definition is affirming the truth defined. We, on the other hand, contend that the statements, "This is so" and "The definition that this is so is true," are the affirmation, direct or reflex, of one and the same objective content.

If our concepts are to be more than purely subjective forms, then the reality corresponding to the statement, "The definition that Christ has two wills is true," must be simply that Christ really has two wills. If this disappears, the content of the definition disappears; there remains a purely verbal formula empty of meaning. After making every possible attempt to divorce the two statements, we still cannot conceive the first without the second—a sign that the second enters into the formal content of the first, that they are one and the same truth.

Just as I cannot affirm that all men are redeemed in Christ and deny that Peter is redeemed in Christ, or affirm that John is the son of Zebedee and deny that Zebedee is the father of John, so neither

can I affirm, "This definition is true" and deny its contents, "Christ has two wills."

What bothers our opponents is that in the example proposed (Peter affirms the truth of John's testimony) one could affirm merely John's *truthfulness*. Thus if John were wrong, Peter could answer the charge of lying by saying, "I could only affirm John's habitual truthfulness, not his unswerving adherence to the truth." But, if Peter were certain of the falsity of John's testimony, and if he affirmed John's truthfulness as absolute, we would certainly be just in accusing Peter of lying.

And yet, is not St. Anthony's presence in heaven a truth completely distinct from the Church's infallibility? We answer: Sometimes the formal content of a revealed truth becomes clear by mere analysis of the proposition. At other times this clarification is possible, only by the use of a minor premise, a process which, if truly deductive, gives us a virtually revealed truth; if merely applicative or explicative, a formally revealed truth.

Thus in order to believe in virtue of the universal principle "All men are redeemed in Christ" the particularization "Peter is redeemed in Christ" we need the applicative minor "Peter exists." Similarly, to believe in virtue of the revealed universal principle "All the Church's definitions are infallible" the particularization "St. Anthony is in heaven" we need the applicative minor "The Church has defined that St. Anthony is in heaven."

Our opponents insist, however, that the statement "This definition of the Church in infallible" and "Mary is immaculate" must be distinct truths because their subjects and predicates are distinct. Let us clarify our thinking.

In certain propositions the terms have their own value and meaning, e.g., "Christ is a man." In others, however, the terms are merely demonstrative, i.e., they are substitutes for other expressions which determine their meaning. Thus in Christ's words to the Samaritan woman, "In this you spoke truly," the meaning of *this* is determined only from the context.

In the same way, "the definitions of the Church" is a demonstrative expression. It can signify much, or nothing (if, for example, the Church had made no definitions). The meaning, then, of *definitions* is determined by each and all of the propositions defined by the Church.

An Historical Confirmation

Many truths defined by the Church have been discovered only by the discussions of great theologians and through laborious analyses and applicative or explicative minors. Now, if every formulation of a truth demanded that it be made in precisely the same terms, these truths would not be formally revealed (contrary to the opinion even of our opponents), but only virtually revealed. This is the best dogmatic-historical confirmation of our thesis.

Refutation of Father Aldama's View

Let us examine more in detail Father Aldama's position.

Father Aldama denies that ecclesiastical faith is something new, adding that before Molina's time this controversy was unknown. Besides, he says, there is considerable confusion among theologians preceding Molina; consequently, even where they seem to treat our problem, they are really concerned with distinct questions. Hence, he advises that we proceed cautiously.

However, merely adverting to the need for caution is not answering the difficulty. This is all the more so since the concepts of ex-

plicit and implicit, formal and virtual (the chief sources of this confusion), are not themselves in question, but rather an elemental idea which every Christian must grasp (since it is the basis of his faith and the root of his supernatural life)—the concept of divine testimony, of God's word.

Now, prior to Molina, theologians were unanimous in teaching that any definition of the Church was ratified by God and to be believed as such. True, they varied in their explanations, but they accorded in their conclusions. We need but look at the reaction which Molina's views produced among them. Suarez, de Lugo, the Dominican, Scotist, and Carmelite schools, all rejected this new theory with surprise. This unanimity continued even after Molina. Only with the rise of Jansenism did it begin to number partisans.

Are we to believe that all theologians before and after Molina were guilty of equivocation in a matter of such importance and practical application; or that in such a matter the faithful could be led willy-nilly into error? In permitting the meaning and scope of her definitions to be thus falsified, the teaching Church could hardly shun responsibility for this error.

Father Aldama insists, however, that in practice it is not necessary for the Church to distinguish between definitions of divine faith and those of ecclesiastical faith, since the infallibility of the Church, which is certainly formally revealed, is always touched at least indirectly.

We reply: Are divine and ecclesiastical faith specifically distinct or not? If they are (as our opponents must hold), clearly the Church runs the risk of leading the faithful to believe with divine faith what is only of ecclesiastical faith.

Lastly, Father Aldama denies that the Church has ever defined as of divine faith a truth which was only virtually revealed.

Tossing forth this flat denial is much easier than defending it against a critical history of theology. Look at the discussions of theologians and Fathers preparatory to definitions accepted by all as of divine faith, and it will be seen that often the only proofs for a definition are true reasoning processes where transit is made from one formal concept to another.

But this truth, according to our opponents, will be found to be formally contained in another font of revelation. What is this font, we ask, of which the theologians and Fathers know nothing? Why do they restrict themselves to arguments which prove nothing? Why do they not cite this font, since doing so is exactly what is needed to prove that the truth is revealed?

If ecclesiastical faith were a defined dogma or a demonstrated truth, this hypothesis of an unknown font would be an acceptable recourse. But when we are treating precisely of whether this faith exists or not, to shelter oneself in such suppositions seems a completely inverted procedure.

Moreover, from the viewpoinnt of apologetics, having to contend against Protestants that all definitions of divine faith are formally contained in the deposit of revelation is, to say the least, a difficult task.

Ecclesiastical faith, therefore, offers very serious difficulties not only in itself, but also in relation to other points of theology. It is contrary to the best theological tradition; it renders impossible any explanation of the evolution of dogma. All such difficulties disappear if we simply eliminate ecclesiastical faith. What obligation, then, is there to keep it?

A Partial List of Journals Consulted in Selecting Articles for THEOLOGY DIGEST

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

Monthly review of theological questions edited and published by The Catholic University of America; 620 Michigan Ave., N.E., Washington 17, D. C.

L'AMI DU CLERGÉ

Weekly review of theological questions edited and published by diocesan clergy of Langres; 4, rue Claude-Gillot, Langres (Hte-Marne), France.

ANTONIANUM

Quarterly journal of philosophy and theology edited and published by the Franciscan Fathers of the Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum; Via Merulana 124, Rome, Italy.

L'ANNÉE THÉOLOGIQUE

Quarterly journal of Études Augustiniennes edited by the Augustinian Fathers, Lormoy, par Montlhéry (S-et-O), France; published by P. Lethielleux; 10, rue Cassette, Paris (VI), France.

***THE BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGIST**

Quarterly published by the American Schools of Oriental Research; Drawer 93A, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

CAHIERS LAENNEC

Quarterly journal of medico-moral questions published by P. Lethielleux; 10, rue Cassette, Paris (VI), France.

COLLECTANEA MECHLINIENSIA

Bi-monthly journal of theology edited and published by diocesan clergy of Malines; 18, rue F. de Merode, Malines, Belgium.

CROSS AND CROWN

Quarterly journal of spiritual theology edited by the Dominican Fathers of the Province of St. Albert; published by B. Herder Book Co.; 15 S. Broadway, St. Louis 2, Mo.

DOWNSIDE REVIEW

Quarterly of Catholic thought edited and published by the Benedictines of Downside Abbey, Bath, England.

DIVUS THOMAS

Quarterly of philosophy and theology edited and published by the Vincentian Fathers; Collegio Alberoni, Piacenza, Italy.

ÉGLISE VIVANTE

Quarterly of missiology published under the direction of the Société des Auxiliaires des Missions; 81, rue Madame, Paris (VI), France.

EPHEMERIDES LITURGICAE

Liturgical quarterly edited and published by the Vincentian Fathers; Via Pompeo Magno 21, Rome, Italy.

ESTUDIOS ECLESIASTICOS

Quarterly review of theology edited by the Jesuit Fathers; published by Ediciones Fax, Zurbano 80, Madrid, Spain.

FRANZISKANISCHE STUDIEN

Quarterly journal of philosophy and theology edited by the Franciscan Fathers of Paderborn; published by Dietrich Coelde-Verlag; Werl u. Münster/Westf., Germany.

IRENIKON

Ecumenical quarterly edited and published by the Benedictines of the Prieuré Bénédictin d'Amay; Chevetogne, Belgium.

IRISH THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Quarterly journal of theology edited and published by the faculty of St. Patrick's College; Maynooth, Ireland.

MAISON-DIEU

Quarterly journal of the Centre de Pastorale Liturgique (Neuilly-sur-Seine); published by Editions du Cerf; 29, Boul. Latour-Maubourg, Paris (VII), France.

MANRESA

Quarterly journal of ascetical and mystical theology edited by the Jesuit Fathers; published by Ediciones Fax, Zurbano 80, Madrid, Spain.

MARIANUM

Quarterly journal of Mariology edited and published by the Servite Fathers; via SS. Apostoli 14, Rome, Italy.

NOUVELLE REVUE THÉOLOGIQUE

Monthly review of theology edited by the Jesuits of the College S. Albert, Louvain; published by Établ. Casterman; 28, rue des Soeurs Noires, Tournai, Belgium.

QUESTIONS LITURGIQUES ET PAROISSIALES

Bi-monthly journal of liturgical thought edited and published by the Benedictines of the Abbaye du Mont-César; Louvain, Belgium.

ORIENTALIA CHRISTIANA PERIODICA

Quarterly (in two issues) of oriental and scriptural studies edited and published by the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies; Piazza S. Maria Maggiore 7, Rome, Italy.

RECHERCHES DE SCIENCE RELIGIEUSE

Quarterly journal of theology edited and published by the Jesuits of Paris; 15, rue Monsieur, Paris (VII), France.

REVISTA ESPAÑOLA DE DERECHO CANONICO

Journal of canon law appearing three times annually edited and published by the Instituto "San Raimundo de Peñafort"; Vitrubio 16, Madrid, Spain.

REVISTA ESPAÑOLA DE TEOLOGIA

Quarterly review of theology edited and published by the Instituto "Francesco Suarez"; Duque de Medinaceli 4, Madrid, Spain.

REVUE D'ASCETIQUE ET DE MYSTIQUE

Quarterly review of ascetical and mystical theology edited and published by the Jesuits of Toulouse; 9, rue Monplaisir, Toulouse, France.

REVUE THOMISTE

Three issues annually edited by the Dominican Fathers of St. Maximin (Var); published by Desclée de Brouwer: Paris-Bruges; 22, quai au Bois, Bruges, Belgium.

THEOLOGIE UND GLAUBE

Bi-monthly journal of theology edited by professors at seminary of Paderborn; published by Verlag Schöningh, Paderborn, Germany.

***THEOLOGY TODAY**

Quarterly review of current Protestant theological thought published by Theology Today at Prince and Lemon Streets, Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

VIE SPIRITUELLE

Monthly journal of spirituality edited by the Dominican Fathers; published by Editions du Cerf, 29, Boul. de Latour-Maubourg, Paris (VII), France.

WORSHIP

Monthly review of liturgical thought edited by the Benedictines of St. John's Abbey; Collegeville, Minnesota.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE

Quarterly journal of theology edited by the Jesuits at Innsbruck; published by Verlag Herder, Wollzeile 33, Wien 1, Austria.

This list will be continued in subsequent issues of THEOLOGY DIGEST.
Journals marked with an asterisk are Protestant.

THEOLOGY DIGEST
1015 CENTRAL ST.
KANSAS CITY 5, MO.

Alma College Library
Los Gatos, Calif.

Printed in U.S.A.